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Welcome from the National KC Director for KC Publication

Dear NASPA colleagues, it is my pleasure to share the 2015 NASPA Knowledge Communities (KC) Publication with you!

Our publication represents the outstanding work of NASPA’s 28 Knowledge Communities, as they advance the KC goals of creating and sharing knowledge.

Each article supports the 2015 NASPA Annual Conference theme of “Navigating with Courage” and provides research updates, emerging trends, and promising practices in student affairs and higher education. The articles also advance the professional competency areas for student affairs professionals.

Included in the NASPA KC Publication is a timely article from Jeanna Mastrodicasa and Hunter Moore, representing our Public Policy Division, discussing how new and seasoned professionals can learn about and become engaged in public policy work that intersects with higher education.

This year we implemented a publication committee to lead the development of the 2015 NASPA KC Publication. My thanks go to all members of the committee (see below) for their tremendous support and dedication to this important project and especially to Ellen Meents-DeCaigny, the committee’s inaugural chair.

Finally, all 28 KCs will be highly visible and engaged in the life of the 2015 NASPA Annual Conference – Navigating with Courage. If you are joining us in New Orleans, I encourage you to continue your learning from this publication by attending a KC-sponsored educational session or meeting more of the KC membership at the annual NASPA Communities Fair held on Monday, March 23 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. in Convention Center, Great Hall B-C.

Best wishes and happy reading!

Frank E. Ross III, Ph.D.

National Director of Knowledge Communities
NASPA Board of Directors
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Northeastern Illinois University
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NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
Those who work in higher education have a keen interest in their professional development but very easily get focused on one specific functional area of expertise. They are routinely tasked with responding to the latest campus crises, which often inspire swells of task forces, assessment initiatives, and seminar trainings focused on the latest crisis area. We all have plenty to do on a daily basis.

Professional development equips new and seasoned professionals alike with greater expertise and more developed skill sets required to meet the changing needs of our dynamic campus environments. We need to make professional development a strategic priority and dedicate time and thought to establishing specific professional development goals. This article outlines resources for informing professional practice, practical recommendations for engaging in the public policy arena, and important considerations for NASPA members to successfully navigate this environment in congruence with the professional competency areas for student affairs practitioners.

Keeping Current and Learning More
Policy matters are dynamic and continue to change as events transpire over time. With each news cycle, we learn more about situations that can have a wide range of policy implications for government agencies and educational institutions alike. As such, it is critical for student affairs professionals to find reliable sources of information to support greater understanding of public policy issues.

NASPA’s Research and Policy Institute (www.naspa.org/rpi) is a primary source for public policy news and analysis related to student affairs, and NASPA members can customize their accounts to receive notifications when new materials and blog posts appear. The official NASPA public policy agenda is driven by the association’s members and is approved by the NASPA Board of Directors. NASPA’s public policy agenda for 2014–2016 focuses on four areas of policy: (a) student success and college completion; (b) issues related to undocumented students; (c) cost of higher education, including related accountability efforts; and (d) student safety and wellness (NASPA Public Policy Division, 2014).
Professional associations make helpful materials available on their websites and use communication tools to inform on the higher education public policy issues relevant to their specific institutions or professionals. For example, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, among other organizations, regularly publishes e-newsletters (http://www.aacu.org/aacu-news); Twitter is another tool to communicate public policy topics. Budgeting time to follow reputable media outlets is also important for staying connected to public policy news. Inside Higher Ed (http://www.insidehighered.com) and The Chronicle of Higher Education (http://www.chronicle.com) are great online resources that publish daily articles and that report on developing news stories affecting college campuses.

Local papers have state and local news that is likely to have the most direct impact on your immediate work; major national newspapers will cover stories that have national or significant state implications. Integrating local and national news review in your routine will help to develop your expertise, better inform your current practice, and help you recognize current needs in order to better connect to your community.

Another news source is related to U.S. Supreme Court decisions: SCOTUSblog (http://www.scotusblog.com). It offers breaking news of U.S. Supreme Court activity and in-depth coverage of cases heard by the court. Although the site is independent of the U.S. Supreme Court, it is an excellent resource for when the court is in session. For example, SCOTUSblog covered the affirmative action cases with in-depth resources.

Professionals in higher education may consider taking a class on campus to spur their development in public policy. Individuals looking to take a class should consider the relative availability of public policy courses at their home or neighboring institutions, or the possibility of an online course, and any institutional policies and expectations on classes.

As higher education professionals, we may be champions for literature review in principle, but our actions and how we choose to channel our attention on a daily basis can at times contradict that role. Find ways to integrate news that relates to public policy in your routine so that literature review becomes a standing tool of your professional development, not just a short-term project.

Get Connected
Professionals seeking opportunities to directly engage with public policy also have a number of outlets available. The first example is to vote—every single time. Stay up to date on governmental affairs at the local, state, and federal levels, even when it is not a presidential election year. Contact legislators about policy issues by phone, e-mails, or meetings that can influence legislative outcomes and help to keep elected officials accountable to their constituents. Contribute to conversations about policy issues by writing letters to the editor of your local newspaper, sharing your opinions or understanding of higher education. Give information and opinions on social media so that your friends and colleagues can understand the issues. Always be appropriate with the use of your time (do this on your own time, not work time) and image (you are only representing yourself, not your employer).

Direct engagement in public policy can also be achieved through organizational involvement. Seek out community-based organizations in your city or town; research options and reach out to local faculty and administrators for advice. Groups such as young professional organizations, nonprofits, or local political parties can be great outlets for you to network and to lend insight on salient policy issues for your community. Also, consider getting involved with your local or state government, such as by serving on an advisory board or participating in community meetings.

Your perspective can be invaluable to raising understanding of policy needs or implications for college campuses and for professional associations. Insight from your host institution can also be appreciated by peer institutions. Take advantage of opportunities within NASPA, such as attending the annual Student Affairs Law and Policy Conference or applying for the Certificate Program in Student Affairs Law and Policy, and attend public policy-related educational sessions or meetings of the Public Policy Division at the 2015 NASPA Annual Conference.

Important Considerations
There are a few key elements to remember as you expand your involvement in the law and policy arena. Maintain firm boundaries. Be clear that you are not representing your institution unless you have specific approval do so. Remember that personal advocacy should not take place during working hours or via a work e-mail account.

Opportunities for specialization exist across the board in higher education public policy. Matters such as access to higher education, student health (e.g., use of alcohol and other drugs), campus safety, civil rights, and issues specific to identity groups (racial and ethnic identity groups, veterans, LGBT populations, etc.) each present their own policy implications for higher education. Make your plan for policy engagement manageable, and focus your energy on a specific area or topic of expertise. This will help you establish a unique and trusted voice on policy matters and maximize the impact of your involvement.
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Services for graduate and professional students continue to evolve and grow as more campuses seek ways to engage this diverse population. There is a growing awareness that graduate students’ needs differ from those of undergraduates, yet similar benefits are realized when such needs are addressed (Brandes, 2006; Gardner, 2010). Faculty and academic administrators are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of socialization and mentorship as components of graduate student success (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). And equally important—though less recognized—is the role graduate student life plays in building a community that supports graduate student success (Education Advisory Board, 2012).

Once the need for graduate student services is identified and recognized, the next challenge is making the case for resources; this can be particularly difficult at predominately undergraduate campuses where graduate students can be an almost invisible student population. How can professionals in graduate and professional student affairs make the case for dedicated resources? Time, energy, and a willingness to create collaborations between student and academic affairs are required. To establish buy-in for this effort, data-driven initiatives are the most powerful. As this case study of Notre Dame’s Graduate Student Life program shows, effective use of research and assessment can lead to support from campus leadership and other partners across campus.

Economic forces and institutional priorities can make securing funds for any new initiative difficult, and this is especially true when this initiative seeks to serve an unfamiliar audience whose needs are neither known nor recognized. Notre Dame’s campus culture focuses primarily on the undergraduate experience—a common occurrence at universities across the country. This condition is rooted in both the history of the institution and the traditional emphasis and assumptions of most student development theory. Widening this focus to encompass postbaccalaureate students was a necessary first step in building a case for resources. The effort gained momentum in 2010–2011, when multiple academic affairs units—including the University Committee on Women, the Life Initiatives Office, the Academic Council, and the Graduate School—worked together to address issues of family-friendly policies and resources.
Although engaging such a diverse cross section of institutional interests was necessary to address an emerging concern on campus—policies for pregnant and parenting students—the effort ultimately ignited fruitful discussion, raised awareness, and rallied support for improved graduate student services. The lasting result was the new level of partnership between the Graduate School and the Division of Student Affairs, which now work together to identify and address the unique needs of the graduate student population. But if raising awareness was step one and building partnerships was step two, then research and assessment were the fuel needed to keep moving forward in building a case for funding—at the very least to specify and justify what to spend and why. At Notre Dame this is unfolding in three distinct phases: exploring, creating, and sustaining, and each is supported with research and assessment.

Though awareness had been building for many years, the formal exploring phase occurred in 2011–2012, when the dean of the Graduate School and the vice president for student affairs asked for recommendations for developing graduate services. Using existing institutional survey data from 2006 and 2010, as well as focus group discussions with current students, priority needs were identified. A review of relevant research was conducted to inform best practices. Benchmarking conversations with colleagues from 17 peer institutions provided context for the most successful initiatives, and a comprehensive assessment of campus services identified gaps and opportunities. The resulting report made 11 recommendations regarding resources, staffing, structure, programming, and partnerships. Survey data, program evaluations, research, and benchmarking provided the justification for investing in graduate services.

The formation phase began in July 2012, when the dean and the vice president each committed to 3 years of shared funding to create Notre Dame Graduate Student Life. Based on the research and assessment of the previous year, and guided by the principles of best practice proposed by Pontius and Harper (2006), the newly formed Graduate Student Life office chose student engagement as its main focus because of its effects on graduate student persistence and its coherence with the mission of Notre Dame’s Division of Student Affairs. Because we envisioned the endeavor as a highly entrepreneurial venture, we immediately borrowed a motto from Brooke Noonan, the University of Chicago’s director of graduate student affairs: “Try everything, track everything!” As we built programs, outreach, training, and communication, we simultaneously built methods of tracking progress. Whether through website analytics, participation numbers, or event feedback forms, we have ways to evaluate everything we do.

In addition to evaluating individual programs, we also revised and re-administered a comprehensive survey of graduate student life, last given in 2006, and achieved a response rate of 59%. We have already used these data to inform programming decisions, to advocate for marginalized populations, to strengthen campus partnerships, and to guide the development of a 5-year strategic plan. Furthermore, by analyzing the correlations and regressions, we have identified which services are most likely to produce the best student outcomes based on our goals of increased graduate student engagement. Though the ultimate student outcome in the world of higher education is graduation, completion rates take many years to measure. Identifying this shorter-term goal, which aligns with our institutional mission, allows for more immediate indicators of success.

Currently, we are in our third year of funding and are preparing for the next phase: sustaining. As we compile all of our data—and prepare to tell our story by the numbers—we trust in three things: the solid foundation of campus partners and supportive leaders in both academic and student affairs, the compelling argument that research and assessment can provide, and the rewards of patience and persistence.

Visit gradlife.nd.edu to see what we’re building!
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Most would agree that higher education has experienced a financial downsizing in recent years and that it will continue to experience similar difficulties in the future. Because of ongoing budget cuts, nonacademic units are faced with the challenge to clearly demonstrate a connection of campus programs and resources to institutional mission and goals, as well as to student learning and success. For those units that serve adult learners or posttraditional students (Soares, 2013)—a population representing approximately 45% of college enrollments (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012)—this important task can be challenging, owing to often disproportionate staffing and funding resources in relation to population size. Multiplying resources by building on successful strategies and best practices from field experts as presented in Increasing Adult Learner Persistence and Completion Rates
(Culp & Dungy, 2014) provides the evidence-based foundation to advocate for and successfully serve this growing population. Pairing this comprehensive resource with your own program data informs a well-supported, institution-specific dialogue. Telling a compelling story is critical to raising awareness of this diverse yet often marginalized population and to making a case to campus administration and other stakeholders for resources to help these students succeed.

Identifying Assessment Resources
For student affairs professionals, guidelines for assessment, evaluation, and research (AER) are readily available through Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2010). In addition, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education provides assessment standards for 43 functional areas, including four that could be relevant to adult learners: Adult Learner Programs and Services; Commuter and Off-Campus Living Programs; Transfer Student Programs and Services; and Veterans and Military Programs and Services. A review of all four functional areas reveals commonalities, which, appropriate to the topic at hand, form the acronym DATA.

• Diversity: There is no “typical” student or a single definition; adult learners are not a homogenous group (Pusser et al., 2007).

• Access: Functional areas must work to provide adult learners with equitable access to programs, services, and engagement opportunities.

• Transition Support: This population of students in particular may experience “transfer shock” and need specific programs to ensure transition success, persistence, and completion.

• Advocacy: Those serving “nontraditional” populations must educate campus constituents about the population and advocate for their unique needs.

Implementing Best Practices
At Southern Illinois University (SIU) Carbondale, a goal of the Non-Traditional Student Services (NTSS) staff includes promoting adult student success through greater inclusivity of such nontraditional groups as parenting students, returning adults, and student veterans. This program goal connects to the broader institutional aim of providing every student with support services to promote successful integration. For adult learners who are balancing multiple life roles, offering programs and services was only the beginning. Finding a way to effectively communicate those offerings would be critical, as longitudinal needs assessment data concluded that students were not engaged on campus largely because they were uninformed. As a result, the single most effective means of outreach and communication used by NTSS is a monthly e-newsletter distributed directly to students’ institutional email and available on the NTSS website (nontrad.siu.edu) for access anytime, anywhere—an effort that aligns with outreach and accessibility principles for effectively serving adult learners (Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, 2005; Pusser et al., 2007). Electronic delivery also minimizes budgetary resources needed for distribution and maximizes the return on investment, as information is instantaneously delivered to a targeted audience of more than 5,600 students who meet defined criteria.

Measurement of newsletter effectiveness included readership data, which increased from 16% (2013) to 53% (2014), and tracking of highlighted programs and services. For example, the Commuter and Non-Traditional Student Kick-Off event, held the first week of the fall semester for new students and featured in the newsletter, increased attendance by 50% from 32 in 2013 to 48 in 2014. Beyond attendance, on-site observation and a postsession survey revealed increased student engagement, with 21% expressing interest in serving on an adult student advisory team. To close the loop (Lindsay & Bergerson, 2014), a compilation of student feedback informed future improvements, with key changes communicated back to students through the newsletter section titled “Your Voice Counts.”

Keeping It All Organized
At NTSS, staff developed a Program Outcomes/Assessment Worksheet (Barnett, 2013) to guide program planning and to maintain consistency with the mission, goals, and standards. This one-page worksheet simplifies program planning and allows for staff, student employees, or students in general to be creative and to explore new program ideas while keeping goals, resources, and assessment in mind. The worksheet is a place to brainstorm and document basic program information (program title, date, time, location, and resources needed); list specific, measurable learning outcomes that connect to the mission and values; and, of course, identify the means of assessment. As part of closing the loop, the worksheet also provides information on how to share results and to whom they can be communicated. The worksheet offers an organized means of program planning by keeping the end in mind. Documenting detailed program-specific plans in this manner also affords historical program data and resource justification.

Telling Your Story
Making connections between assessment findings and the institutional mission is critical to communicating a compelling story to leaders who are forced to make difficult decisions in tough economic times. Like the adult learner population, the assessment process is not “one size fits all.” Determining the best means of assessment, evaluation, and research that will tell a compelling story on behalf of your program and advocate for the students you serve is vitally important to institutional support and resource allocation.
In addition to quantitative data, student voices can be the most persuasive factor, particularly in linking student services and retention. An NTSS satisfaction survey conducted in fall 2013 resulted in meaningful and compelling student testimonials including, “NTSS gives me opportunities to participate in campus life in a way that works with my work and family life. Feeling a part of [the university] helps me be a successful, happy student” and “Transition support for me and my son was a determining factor in choosing SIU!” Combined, these statements speak volumes to stakeholders about the importance and effectiveness of your adult learner programs and services.

So, begin telling your story. And not just any story, but a compelling, attention-getting, data-driven, evidence-based story. WHAT is your story? WHO is your story about? The \textit{what} and the \textit{who} are worth it. So, don’t wait. Become a storyteller.
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In 1954, Emmett Till, a 13-year-old African American male, was beaten to death and thrown in a local waterway while in Mississippi on summer vacation (http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/till/index.html). Mamie Till, Emmett’s mother, decided to leave his casket open despite the gruesome condition of his remains. Emmett Till’s murder and funeral service brought America’s racial violence to national and international attention. “Leaving the casket open” is a metaphor that challenges discomfort and reservations about discussing racial realities of Black Americans. It also honors Mamie Till’s decision and courage to show the world what racism did to her son.

Sixty years after Till’s murder, America is still burying Black males. On February 26, 2012, Trayvon Martin was shot and killed while walking from a store. On July 14, 2014, Eric Garner died while being restrained by police. On August 14, 2014, police shot and killed Michael Brown in daylight with his hands apparently raised. The caskets of these men, as well, need to remain open.

The killings of these young men weigh heavily on my heart as a mother of an African American male, a professional, and a scholar. In my career, I have advised Black male student organizations for several years. As an advisor, I listened to narratives about police profiling and harassment because the males were perceived as threats, both on and off campus (Yosso, 2005). Thus, I challenge the field of student affairs to leave the caskets open by asking, “How do we prepare and equip Black male students to navigate the racially hostile spaces found within the academy and the community?” I suggest student affairs personnel become more engaged in reflexive conversations on race and create programs that foster explicit conversations on race.

Racialized Experiences of Black Males

The treatment of Black men on campuses illustrates how universities are microcosms of American society. Yet it seems that we lack the courage or motivation to critically examine and address the racial realities—and how they manifest themselves in student affairs—because many believe racism is sufficiently addressed. Constructs of race and racism are embedded in the systems and policies that shape the experiences of people of color, especially our Black male students. Therefore, student affairs professionals must proactively seek out ways to illuminate systematic and structural injustice within and beyond our campuses (Bell, 1979; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012).

Despite advances in social justice efforts through affirmative action, civil rights, and the women’s movement, Black Americans still deal with the negative, deficit, and dehumanizing construct of Blackness (Mills, 1997). Empirical data, both quantitative and qualitative, highlight the institutional racism—exemplified by, for example, aggression and ignorance—that positions Black males as targets of stereotypes (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). Critical race scholars assert that racial realities are normalized oppression through structural and systemic channels (Friere, 1970). Normalized racism is defined as practices that oppressed groups become accustomed to (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012), and Mills (1997) contended that constructs of race are normalized within systems and institutions. Hughes and Giles (2010) suggested that scholars and practitioners perform critical observations and assessment of the academy, called “Crit-Walking,” to shed light on the systems of oppression and expose how the normalized protocols and procedures marginalize people of color. Harper (2012) challenged us to stop referring to the racial climate in studies and research as chilly and call
it what it is: racism. Racial profiling and microaggressions affect how Black males experience and perceive themselves in campus environments (Smith et al., 2007). Therefore, it is time for us as a profession to ask how we can more directly address issues of race on campus.

The Open Casket as Metaphor
Deciding to leave the casket open is a conscious effort to mobilize communities to speak out about the role of racism and the way racist attitudes and perceptions lead to the mental and emotional—and to the actual physical—death of Black youth. Leaving the casket open also creates space for students to talk openly about the ugly experiences of racism at their institutions.

We must begin to consider the role of critical discourse in the programs and activities student affairs offers. As an ethical issue, we need to offer professional spaces where we examine personal issues of race. Practitioners can no longer afford to discuss leadership, peer collaboration, or program modeling without acknowledging the racial realities of American society. Regardless of the type of institution, the experiences and racial profiling of Black men and women are crucial issues. Staff must facilitate discussions and encourage dialogue across difference. Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Bell, 1979), a theoretical frame that recognizes that race and racism are real and normalized in American societies, should be used as a tool to explore aspects of higher education (Hughes & Giles, 2010). At Columbia University, Professor Yolanda Ruiz implemented a race roundtable series. At my own institution, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, I created a Critical Race Dialogue series. Both of these programs are open to campus and community members. Intergroup Dialogue is a campuswide program founded by University of Michigan that brings groups together to engage in training and a series of workshops that address difference. Leaving the casket open demands that, as professionals, we explore race and racism among ourselves and then extend the opportunities to community stakeholders.

Acknowledgment and Explicit Action
Ultimately, student affairs needs to leave open the caskets of Martin, Brown, and Garner to spur dialogue and to mobilize faculty, staff, and students to action. The deaths of these young men, similar to Till’s death, challenge practitioners to acknowledge and address racial and gender inequities. In large and small ways, these recent killings affect the work of our profession. For example, during the media coverage associated with the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, a photographer captured a Black police officer displaying a hand symbol representing his collegiate service fraternity. The media reported that the image was a gang sign; that information was inaccurate, uninformed, and unjust. How many of us acknowledge that inaccurate news reporting is harmful to the students we work with on a daily basis? Communities affected by slanderous misinterpretation include members of Black Greek-letter organizations and Black males in general.

Leaving the casket open is about recognizing injustice, calling attention to facts in spite of discomfort, and exposing inequities and racism in higher education. This article is a call to action. I challenge administrators and practitioners to engage in a dialogue that acknowledges the tenets of CRT and how systematic racism informs the work we do. Ethically, as a profession, we have to acknowledge that racism is prevalent and embedded in campus policies and systems. As professionals, individually and collectively, we need to take action and use CRT as a tool to examine our offices and institutions. Courage is not enough for a person of color navigating spaces in our society. Courage cannot shield Black men or women from racial micro- and macroaggressions that impact their physical safety. I implore you to leave the casket open to allow for dialogue, education, understanding, and advancement on matters of race.

References
The 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that college students are still engaging in higher rates of high-risk drinking than are their noncollege peers (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2013). According to the spring 2014 National College Health Assessment, students believe that 95% of their peers have previously used alcohol (American College Health Association, 2014). This culture has caused researchers to deem our universities “abstinent-hostile environments” (Laudet, Harris, Kimball, Winters, & Moberg, 2014, p. 87).

“There is a place in this movement for everybody, whether you just want to share your story at a school, share your story with your neighbor, or you want to speak to your legislator about how important supporting addiction recovery is for our communities” — Greg Williams, producer, The Anonymous People
Where are incoming and current students learning about this culture of alcohol use? A recently published article in the Chronicle of Higher Education by Bowerman (2014) reports on the “I’m Shmacked” party promotion video company, which purports to be a new way for high school students to scout colleges. In one video shot at the University of Arizona (U of A), a female individual who one assumes is a current student, proclaims that “U of A is the University of Alcoholics.” This video has close to 400,000 views (Shmacked, 2014).

Although the aforementioned data seem bleak, there is a plethora of research documenting the efficacy of programs to help college students enter and sustain long-term recovery (Kaskutas, 2009; Kelly, Stout, Zywiak, & Schneider, 2006; Moos & Moos, 2006). Alcoholics Anonymous is one such program. It is a 12-step, group, peer-based program designed to help individuals enter and sustain long-term recovery. Recently, researchers have demonstrated success with similar interventions that aid in recovery support and academic success with college students (Labbe, Greene, Bergman, Hoeppner, & Kelly, 2013; Terrien, 2013; Watson, 2014). A major influential factor in these groups is peer support (Groh, Jason, Davis, Olson, & Ferrari, 2007). The research clearly advocates for on-campus programs that intentionally bring together students to support recovery.

The recovery movement on college campuses is not new. Rutgers, Augsburg College, and Texas Tech University have had successful Collegiate Recovery Programs (CRPs) since the 1980s. A few programs were added to the CRP portfolio during the 1990s. Significant federal changes, grassroots efforts, and philanthropists came forward to lead an explosion of CRP programs in 2010. President Barack Obama, in his National Drug Control Strategy (2010), challenged the nation to increase access to treatment and to improve support for individuals in recovery (Executive Office of the President, 2010). In order to provide support for these efforts, the president created the Recovery Branch of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). In 2011, Stacie Mathewson, a philanthropist from Nevada, formed a foundation to support the development of CRPs. Her effort began with the University of Reno and subsequently launched a nationwide grant program that forever changed the landscape of collegiate recovery. In 2013, she formed Transforming Youth Recovery, which provides recovery-related tools, resources, and grants. In 2013, filmmaker Greg Williams debuted his first full-length feature film, The Anonymous People. The film gave a voice to the estimated 23 million Americans living in long-term recovery and helped to educate the nation on the power of recovery. According to Transforming Youth Recovery, there are now more than 120 efforts on college campuses to support students in recovery (J. Parisi, personal communication, October 7, 2014).

It can be helpful to reflect on the lived experience of a student in recovery to best understand how to meet his or her needs. Imagine the life of an 18-year-old high school student, fresh out of treatment with 60 days of sobriety, planning to attend college. What are the active threats to his or her recovery as he or she moves into a residence hall, navigates the first day of classes, or experiences homecoming? For a published account of one individual’s path, read “Filling in the Gaps of the Continuum of Care for College-Age Students in Recovery” (Taylor, 2014).

We, as educators and as student affairs practitioners, have a duty to support those students who are seeking or who are actively engaged in recovery. For those of you at campuses without a formal recovery effort, please accept this challenge:

- Host a showing of The Anonymous People.
- Learn about campus and community efforts to support students in recovery, such as 12-step meetings, treatment centers, chemical dependency counselors, and programs within counseling and health services.
- Help students start a student organization to support recovery.
- Reach out to an existing CRP to ask for help, contact Transforming Youth Recovery, attend a conference session, or read the current research.
- Host a recovery town hall meeting and see what students and community members want.

Resources

- The Anonymous People
  manyfaces1voice.org
  A website for The Anonymous People (2013) documentary on the recovery movement
- Association of Recovery in Higher Education
  collegiaterecovery.org
  An association focused on supporting collegiate recovery programs
- Transforming Youth Recovery
  transformingyouthrecovery.org
  A nonprofit organization that seeks to support recovery programs in high schools, colleges, and universities throughout the United States
- Young People in Recovery
  youngpeopleinrecovery.org
  An organization that changes the world so all young people in or seeking recovery are given the opportunity to become empowered
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The rapidly growing Asian American student population, coupled with women continuing to outnumber men in higher education enrollment, calls for a greater examination of Asian and Pacific Islander (API) identity, gender identity, and perceptions of leadership (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; Wang & Teranishi, 2012). The increase of Asian American women in higher education challenges student affairs professionals to critically examine leadership models, outreach, and development for API women. It is imperative that inclusive leadership development programs enable API women students to navigate with courage, validate their identities, and understand their impact on society. This article will review selected literature and theories that inform inclusive leadership education for female API college students. The article concludes with suggestions on how student affairs professionals may apply the various theories to effectively engage API college women in leadership development opportunities.
There are significant disparities between API college men and women within in-curricular activity (Liu & Sedlacek, 1999), which is reflected in dissimilar levels and types of involvement and fulfillment of leadership positions in student organizations. Because of this inequity, differentiated approaches to leadership development for API women should be considered. The following models and literature are recommended to serve as conceptual foundations that may address the leadership and involvement gap for API women students: Accapadi’s (2012) Polycultural Model of Asian American Identity Consciousness, Lawless and Fox’s (2013) literature concerning women’s pursuit of leadership roles, and the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Komives & Wagner, 2012). Collectively, these theories highlight the necessity of infusing perceptions of leadership, intersecting identities, and intentional outreach in developing effective leadership development programs for API college women.

A synopsis of the literature reiterates the multifaceted considerations required for developing programmatic interventions for API college women. Accapadi (2012) reconceptualized identity development theories for Asian Americans, including Kim’s (2001) model, by suggesting that Asian American identity is complex and nuanced, the consciousness of which is often developed in tandem with other social identities, such as gender. Accapadi (2012) said that because people experience multiple intersecting identities simultaneously—and are often members of multiple oppressed groups—scholars must consider how a sense of one’s identity is developed as a coherent whole rather than as distinct parts, with each identity influencing how a person experiences their other identities. For API college women, gender may serve as a point of entry to racial/ethnic identity consciousness and shape how they engage with race (Accapadi, 2012). Programmatic models for API women should emphasize the intersections of race and gender within dialogues, literature, and experiential practices as an effective means to engage students in meaningful reflection about leadership.

Alongside race and ethnicity, it is important to consider how gender identity influences perceptions of leadership. Women are less likely than men to seek leadership positions, less likely than men to receive career-enhancing professional sponsorship and support, and vastly underrepresented in politics and management roles (Lawless & Fox, 2013). Lawless and Fox (2013) argued that women and men differ in their motivations for pursuing leadership roles: men are more likely to seek positional power, whereas women often pursue issue-specific leadership opportunities. Such patterns are consistent with those identified by Liu and Sedlacek (1999), in reference to API students’ cocurricular involvement. Thus, student affairs professionals need to be conscious of these realities when implementing leadership programs that critically examine the impact of structural power on API women’s leadership development.

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development provides a useful orientation to examine best practices for engaging API college women around issues of societal change. The model emphasizes the development of sense of self and individual awareness as a foundation for in-group and community involvement to confront specific social issues (Komives & Wagner, 2012). Based on this framework, it is reasonable to assume that as API college women develop a consciousness regarding their personal intersecting identities with their perceptions of leadership, they’ll be better equipped to directly influence local and global social change. The Social Change Model may help to inform the structure of new and existing leadership development programs by allowing API college women to sequentially explore their identities, reflect on their in-group participation, and direct their energy toward producing a community-based outcome.

Integration of the aforementioned theoretical frameworks and literature into new or established leadership development programs on college campuses could increase the effectiveness of cultivating API women leaders. Together, this information offers a holistic approach to designing intentional, inclusive leadership education for API women students that encourages them to go beyond identity reflection and to translate their understanding of self into culturally relevant action. Through practices centered on fostering avenues for these students to explore and define their own authenticity, they will be guided and challenged to seek the knowledge and awareness necessary to turn their aspirations into skills and action. The selected theories and literature may also inform the ways practitioners might successfully engage API women in leadership programs that may previously have seemed irrelevant or inapplicable to this student population.

To address the gender gap among college students in leadership participation (Liu & Sedlacek, 1999), practitioners should personalize outreach to API women students and encourage them to pursue opportunities of positional power in student organizations, student government, or relevant campus steering committees (Lawless & Fox, 2013). Targeted, issue-specific outreach may result in more on-campus leadership roles occupied by API college women. Within existing leadership development programs or in conversation with API women student leaders, practitioners may consider infusing a discussion of social identities. As the Polycultural Model of Asian American Identity Consciousness (Accapadi, 2012) suggests, intentionally guiding students to reflect on their own identities in these forums may illuminate how race and gender shape perceptions of leadership for API college women. Once API women students develop an understanding of their own identities and of community memberships, and build confidence in their approaches as leaders, they may be better prepared to strategically place themselves in positions to create social change (Komives & Wagner, 2012).
To prepare API college women to courageously pursue a wide array of opportunities, both on campus and beyond, it is vital that student affairs professionals help this population to explore the intersections of race, gender, and perceptions of leadership. API women will then be better equipped to translate their self-exploration into meaningful practice. The models presented in this article provide resources, guidance, and inspiration to refine existing programs or to develop of future programs focused on leadership education designed for API college women. Exploring ways in which the intersections of race and gender impact how API women define and embody the notion of “leadership” will provide practitioners with a more culturally informed approach to developmental programming. Through advocacy, support, and empowerment, student affairs professionals can encourage API college women to develop self-awareness of their resiliency and authenticity, increase congruence of their social identities, reaffirm their contributions to communities of color, and model effective leadership for future generations.
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We end where we begin, and then begin anew. Indigenous ways of knowing offer valuable, challenging, and humbling new methods of exploring the assessment cycle through a closer examination of the circle—which, while a similar shape, constitutes a vastly different way of thinking, working, and sharing. Although the assessment cycle is a worthy model for meaningful assessment, it and its components carry far less weight and worth without a deeply held and consistently practiced underlying philosophy. Greater than the purposeful and necessary pursuits of success or change, community, connection, and conversation can extend beyond traditional definitions to mirror a grander commitment to learning and the many people and places our work can impact.

For the most part, my knowledge of indigenous beliefs and practices and their origins has come via secondhand means through work with a local institution’s Indigenous Student Services. These hidden and complex patterns offer a deeply interconnected and holistic view of the world (Eglash, 2002), where relationships are more than coefficients or scientific fact; they are essential connections that offer the balance and diversity necessary to maintain harmony among all forms of life. This highly subjective and strongly interconnected worldview disrupts traditional notions about power and privilege, both in higher education and in the assessment cycle itself.
What qualifies as a "good" result or the "best-case scenario" when analyzing data is not, and cannot be, decided on by a single person or committee. In fact, even if an arbitrary point of positivity were marked, that point quickly would become a moving target, heavily influenced by the observation and interpretation of the external environment and individual student behavior. Thus, assessment is much more than evaluation and much bigger than a grade or rubric. Each step along, beside, or even off the path of one student’s learning journey can and will affect everything around him or her. No one person or event is too small to make change.

Expanding on the commonly discussed challenges to the weight of subjective data on influencing decision making, the concept of dewhu’Li’, from the Washo language of the Washoe tribe, acknowledges rather than dismisses the considerable and profound knowledge of the many innermost thoughts and feelings students carry with them into our institutions. Though inherently inaccessible, these ghost realities remain just as valid and reliable as the stories that are spoken and shared externally. The source of information we use to make change may be unknown and the data collected are not always reliable, but the positive impact on the wider, deeply connected community—both those who participated in the program and those still yet to join in—is what must be described and counted as success.

In a political, social, and institutional climate riddled with the challenging, complex, and constantly changing demands of accountability and responsibility, indigenous ways of knowing, learning, and evaluating individuals and experiences seem to run counter to the fervent goals of remaining relevant, visible, and ahead of the wildly swinging curve. Navigating an environment rife with contentious, fickle standards can elicit a response of over-justification, in which we examine and extract every piece of information and as much data as possible to prove our worth. The ultimately courageous worldview that the indigenous culture provides, however, puts aside ideals of value and status for a strongly held conviction of connection—thereby deepening the view of the whole student and the holistic student experience into one of a whole community, widening the assessment cycle to overlapping spheres of influence that incorporate, rather than reject, the significance of all parts of our external and internal worlds. As Chief Seattle, chief of the Duwamish tribe after whom the city was named, offered, “We did not weave the web of life; we are merely a strand in it—whatever we do to the web, we do to ourselves” (Jeffers, 1991, p. 21). Assessment is therefore not merely a method of inquiry but a courageous and continuous act of exploring and strengthening each strand of the web, following the cycle wherever it may lead.

Therefore, the act of assessment is a method of evaluation, a mission of discovery, and the strengthening of community. The cycle is not a single circle, but a series of interconnected rings that represent the deeply personal stories of our students. Each time we end a cycle, we find new ways to celebrate and encourage success; when we begin again, we carry those lessons with us, helping to write new sentences and chapters. The cycle is both a practical process and an abstract metaphor; it reminds us that our work continues with us and will carry on long after us. Indigenous customs and culture teach us that learning is not a destination to which we must rush; rather, it is an intentional, thoughtful, and often meaningful journey we never have to take alone.
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Only months into a new academic year, stories reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education and Inside Higher Ed seem all too familiar. Inside Higher Ed reported on September 19, 2014 that eight first-year college students had died on campus; the story was followed by reports of additional student deaths across the country (New, 2014). National news can force colleges and universities to look at their own emergency procedures, such as the outbreak of the Ebola virus in West Africa.

This national dialogue reminded higher education administrators of the need to focus not only on academics but also on the unexpected dangers a campus may face. The need to safeguard students as they pursue their degrees is paramount to providing the necessary environment to help them succeed. As a result of several events of the past decade—such as the hurricanes along the Gulf Coast and the shootings at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University—many institutions have reevaluated their crisis or emergency plans, and have established new prevention and intervention teams (Hemphill & Leblanc, 2010; McCullar, 2011; Zdziarski, Dunkel, & Rollo, 2007). Although this is an important step, administrators should not rest when it comes to campus safety.

Unfortunately, crisis management can be pushed to the back of an institution’s priority list for multiple reasons. First, many administrators still operate under the perspective that a major crisis is unrealistic for their campus, often referred to as the “It can’t happen to us” syndrome (Bernstein, 2013). Second, in a time of limited financial resources, it is hard for some administrators to justify funds for something that is not a pressing need. Another barrier can be recent modifications to strategic
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The conversation regarding crisis management and safety often occurs within the ranks of senior-level administrators, emergency management team members, or specialized units in student affairs, such as student conduct, residential life, and counseling units. While it is respectable that these teams and units are having this discussion, most other employees are not, especially on a routine basis. Many student affairs units and higher education personnel on the front lines have not been part of this conversation (McCullar, 2011; Van Brunt & Lewis, 2014).

It is time to broaden the conversation of crisis and emergency management to more personnel within the institution. Institutions often distribute an emergency-preparedness quick reference guide to employees or place them in the classrooms to inform them of what to do if a crisis occurs (examples are found at http://goo.gl/ln5RJl and http://goo.gl/L7CrUc). Often these guides are glanced at and then put aside as faculty and administrators go about their daily routines. Instead, the personnel need to be engaged in the discussion of crisis and emergency management, specifically about what could happen in their unit.

**New Actions**

Taking institutional crisis and emergency management to the next level should now include discussions at the departmental level. Ideally, this would be guided from the senior administrators in a division, such as the vice president of student affairs, dean of students, and head of public safety. Usually, these senior members either are part of the established emergency management teams or have direct access to the campus wide plan. Each department within the division should be informed of how they are connected to the campus master plan.

Next, at the department level, administrators need to discuss their department’s role during a crisis and how they fit into the master plan. From there, the team members should discuss what they would do in a variety of campus-impacting scenarios, such as a campus shooter or campus closure for severe weather. From there, they can look at what events could be specific to their department and could cause disruption in their departmental functions.

To employ this approach, department directors could take 10 minutes out of a meeting once a month to discuss crisis management. This would be a great time to talk with the staff about their possible roles during an emergency. Directors could use this time to run through a hypothetical situation, how it would impact the staff members, and what their roles would be. Incidents that could impact their unit could be examined, and response plans could be developed. Scenarios could be designed utilizing the Crisis Matrix of Zdziarski, Dunkel, and Rollo (2007). By talking through a possible scenario or participating in a tabletop exercise, staff members could better understand their roles, identify important campus partners, and plan how they can continue their operations if there is a communication breakdown from higher in the administrative structure. This could help staff understand what they should or should not do in these times of crisis.

**Conclusion**

Frontline student affairs employees—along with support from staff, faculty, and facilities personnel—are often the first to have contact with students. When something happens on campus, they may often be the first responder or the first person students turn to for guidance. These individuals need to have the proper knowledge and training on how to handle or direct the situation. If they have not been part of the conversation or lack some specific training, they will not be able to best assist when needed.

Finally, we must continue evaluating and discussing these plans. New employees are constantly entering the student affairs field. Each time one person leaves and a new person enters, the team dynamic changes. Roles and responsibilities will need to be discussed. The unwritten rules and expectations will need to be communicated. Networks and connections across the campus will need to be built. It is our duty to make sure all of those in our organization are prepared for the possibilities.
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The number of students with disabilities attending higher education has continued to grow. At present, approximately 11% of college students have a disability (Raue & Lewis, 2011), and this estimate has almost doubled since 1999 (Lewis & Farris, 1999). Although the increased access to higher education for individuals with disabilities is a positive force, disability services providers often struggle to provide adequate support beyond the required academic accommodations, and this is a disservice to students with disabilities who need greater personal, social, and vocational support in order to be successful in college and beyond.

One critical area for service providers is the career development of students with disabilities. Overall, persons with disabilities are chronically under- or unemployed. According to the U.S. Department of Labor (2015), the unemployment rate of persons with disabilities in December 2014 was 11.2%, compared with 5.1% of those without disabilities. Although greater access to postsecondary education is a key factor in better career achievement for students with disabilities, more attention must be given to help them develop job skills. On many campuses, career services centers are an effective resource in helping all students explore and attain a career; however, students with disabilities often present unique challenges that traditional career counselors may not be adequately prepared to address. Disability services providers can serve a vital role in partnering with career services staff in order to better serve students with disabilities.

Research has shown that even before students with disabilities reach higher education, they have encountered challenges that have impacted their ability to focus on career development (Hitchings et al., 2001). These include the direct impact of their disability on their learning, the amount of time required to compensate for a disability, and the low expectations of others. These factors often combine to create a lack of vocational awareness. As a result, some students with disabilities arrive on college campuses already at a disadvantage when it comes to career development.
Briel and Wehman (2005) identified nine challenges students with disabilities face in terms of career development:

- Being comfortable with their disability
- Building self-esteem and confidence
- Learning about their disability and its impact on learning or the work environment
- Becoming familiar with compensatory strategies and assistive technology
- Learning about protections afforded and responsibilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- Acquiring the self-disclosure skills and the ability to request accommodations
- Obtaining workplace supports through community resources
- Learning how to manage insensitive employer comments and attitudes
- Gaining traditional employment experiences (p. 293)

One approach disability services providers can take to address these needs is to collaboratively promote career development for their students. A successful model is the work done by the University of Washington DO-IT center (Burgstahler, 2001).

When considering such collaborations, four key areas are helpful to consider: skills development, personal awareness, knowledge of the world of work, and interpersonal skills. The first area—skill development—encompasses the student’s knowledge of their field of study’s content. Disability services providers spend a large proportion of their time supporting this area through academic advising, classroom accommodations, and other traditionally provided services. Over the past two decades, the importance of increasing students’ knowledge of assistive technology and how they can use it effectively has become an important component in this area.

The second area is personal awareness, which includes a student’s awareness of his or her disability, his or her confidence and self-esteem, and other personal characteristics. Disability services providers can play a role in this area by collaborating more closely with campus counseling centers and wellness centers. In addition, support groups and other activities that can help students better recognize their own strengths and growth areas can be beneficial.

The third area, the world of work, is critical, as it can go a long way in helping students with disabilities develop careers. Understanding career opportunities related to a field of study is crucial, so one way to help students is to assist them with exploring and obtaining internships; career services offices are essential partners in this endeavor. Through working more closely with a career services office, providers can discover internships that may be specifically geared toward students with disabilities. Helping students connect with a career services provider early in their academic careers can also be a vital piece in their long-term success.

The fourth area, interpersonal skills, includes helping students develop self-disclosure skills and the ability to ascertain when and how to disclose a need for an accommodation. They must also be able to explore how to handle workplaces that may be unaccustomed to having employees with disabilities, while at the same time being aware of the legal protections afforded them under employment law. This can be a tremendously challenging task. Addressing these issues with students throughout their academic careers can help them develop these important skills. For example, help students to decide if, when, and how much to self-disclose in their coursework; it offers a learning model for their future careers. In addition, disability services providers can help foster self-advocacy and self-determination skills, which often contribute to greater success in postsecondary and career settings (Getzel & Thoma, 2008).

In summary, disability services providers must collaborate outside of the disability office to further the career development of students with disabilities. A key collaborator is the career services office, whose staff gives career development expertise, while the disability services staff can offer expertise about disability. When the two work together, an integrative approach to career development can be achieved. In addition to the career services office, other key collaborators include counseling centers, wellness centers, and employers that recruit on campus for internships. Students with disabilities can benefit from this integrative approach that not only supports their success on campus but also their success in the workplace.
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With a number of high-profile incidents, the fall 2014 semester was a difficult time for fraternities and sororities. Among the most memorable events were hazing allegations for former sorority member Miss America, Wesleyan University moving toward coeducational status, one fraternity creating the “no means yes, yes means anal” slogan, fraternity members illegally distributing a sex tape as a rush video, two fraternity chapters allegedly drugging multiple women, Clemson University temporarily suspending 24 organizations, and California State University, Northridge, suspending all new member and recruitment operations.

In the face of these incidents, the question fraternity and sorority professionals should ask is not how to react but whether the traditional structure of these organizations is still relevant on college campuses. Although some might defend this semester as an anomaly, in reality this semester is just a continuing trend of negative behavior and community harm. Every year, similar high-risk incidents take place. As one critic eloquently summarized it: “These are not anomalies or bad apples: numerous studies have found that men who join fraternities are three times more likely to rape, and that women in sororities are 74% more likely to experience rape than other college women” (Valenti, 2014, para. 3). These figures omit the casualties fraternities and sororities provoke, including 60 hazing deaths since 2005 (Lauerman & Gilblom, 2014).

It is time to face the truth: fraternities and sororities are the Titanic and the 21st century is the iceberg. A mix of cultural changes, generational issues, and technology have redefined the collegiate sorority and fraternity experience and, in turn, its relevance. Behaviors have adapted quicker than campuses and organizations can react, and what is left is a crumbling foundation. The problem lies in clinging to the notion that these traditional, historical structures are unsinkable. Fraternities and sororities are broken, and nothing about their current reality can be fixed. Does that mean that whoever is riding this sinking ship is doomed?

There is hope, but it can become manifest only through change. Change must begin with how professionals think and then extend to changes in policies and governance. There must be a willingness among professionals to adopt new, personal foundations built on innovative methods, even if such schools of thought lie outside the traditional realm of the fraternity and sorority. At a basic level, organizations and campuses can begin training staff members in innovation methodology.
The fear is that current professionals are unwilling to admit this need for change and will continue to do the exact thing they warn students against: clinging to tradition because change comes with an inherent risk of failure. There must be a caution against holding onto past defenses and moving too slowly until change is forced upon these organizations; instead, current professionals should adopt systems that allow for careful, methodical innovation.

Two types of innovation, evolutionary and disruptive, offer ways to approach change in sorority and fraternity organizations. Evolutionary innovation happens over time with the right change agents and the proper level of knowledge being utilized to take productive risk, resulting in returns or failures that still prompt growth (Rahmeyer, 1989). Disruptive innovation is much harsher, manifesting in guttural, volatile manners and potentially ending in change or chaos, depending on how it runs its course (Jones, 2006). Where disruptive innovation can result in wins, the results cannot always be controlled.

Currently, few professionals are engaged in evolutionary innovation, and many are caught in disruptive innovation. Organizations are reacting instead of acting. Negative situations are managed only after they occur. This creates circumstances where occasionally policies or programs are successful in promoting change but more frequently the attempted solutions result in lengthy processes with no tangible outcomes. To ensure the survival of fraternities and sororities, professionals must consider adopting a methodology that cultivates predictive, controlled changes.

One of the few examples for evolutionary innovation can be seen in the work of Kimbrough (2005), who argued for the removal of National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) undergraduate chapters. Although radical, Kimbrough’s idea— if built around the proper framework—would promote gradual change. The innovation behind Kimbrough’s idea is to question the traditional practices of the NPHC. It is unheard of to consider removing undergraduate chapters from the organization, the very constituency on which the NPHC was built. Kimbrough provided a recommendation that takes one aspect of the current NPHC reality—large levels of graduate engagement—and proposes a novel solution that could transform NPHC groups. The crucial element lies in professionals choosing these types of changes before their environments demand them. Instead of reacting to emerging factors, professionals must be willing to look into the future and take risks that can be controlled and measured. Because this type of thinking is limited within the current arena, adopting these types of innovative methodologies means looking outside of student affairs.

Few examples of evolutionary innovation within fraternities and sororities exist. As part of the academic enterprise, student affairs is not necessarily the first place one looks to study radical change. If professionals wish to expand their knowledge and develop competencies to cultivate innovation, they must be willing to look beyond the academic arena. Instead of limiting professional development to attending student affairs conferences, campus trainings, or reading material only related to higher education, there must be a willingness to learn from widely diverse systems. This learning, while self-directed, can come from numerous sources. Examples include attending regional TEDx events, listening to campus guest lecture series on non–student affairs topics, or subscribing to such magazines as Inc. and Fast Company. With a little willingness to explore surrounding communities for professional development opportunities, the options are limitless.

One of the first steps in cultivating new competencies, skills that begin on a personal level before shaping greater policy, lies in broadening the type of knowledge being shared within the community. Inspiration and innovation can stem from anywhere. Looking externally empowers members to critically question internal struggles. Seeking outside perspectives allows professionals the chance to redefine the problems they are addressing. Being open to new perspectives on current issues is the first step in removing a bias toward reacting, and instead prompting new actions.

Fraternities and sororities stand at a crossroads. These once-historic bastions of the collegiate experience have hit the iceberg. Evolutionary innovation and disruptive innovation are two options that stand before their members. If organizations are to survive, if they wish to remain relevant, and even thrive, they must evolve. Determining the path of this evolution requires professionals to develop new frameworks for viewing the field. All the answers may not yet exist, but by acknowledging the failure of current structures and practices professionals can work together to find creative alternatives that are hopefully in line with evolutionary innovation.
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Introduction and Research Questions
Within the diverse student affairs profession, some staff members identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB),* and they are present in professional associations, including the two dominant organizations: NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education and the American College Personnel Association. Additionally, some of these staff members are “out” on their campuses and in the field. Yet some staff members who identify as LGB keep their identities to themselves for a variety of reasons, including fear of discrimination, resulting in some cases in a lavender ceiling that prevents LGB-identified staff from attaining campus executive positions.

Workplace discrimination continues to be a part of the American workforce and is prevalent among LGB workers across career fields (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Even with an open and inclusive environment on a college campus, LGB-identified individuals still exhibit higher levels of stress and anxiety than their heterosexual colleagues (Cochran, 2001). Senior student affairs officers are not immune—they also must navigate stress-causing factors of politics, personal style, or partner status in deciding how visible they wish to make their LGB identity (Renn, 2003).

This study sought to identify perceived barriers to career outcomes of LGB-identified student affairs officers and whether there are barriers to obtaining their careers of choice. Understanding the complexities of various career paths involves interviewing various student affairs officers to garner their perspectives on career advancement.

The term “lavender ceiling” is derived from the commonly used “glass ceiling” metaphor. The glass ceiling symbolizes invisible barriers through which women can see elite positions but cannot reach them because of gender inequities in the workplace (Hesse-Biber & Carter, 2005, p. 77); the lavender ceiling describes similar issues for LGB employees, specifically the unofficial barriers they may face in moving up the career ladder. This barrier has been and continues to be unbreakable (Unger, 2011).

Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Knowledge Community
CRACKING THE LAVENDER CEILING: LESBIAN, GAY, AND BISEXUAL STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS AND THEIR PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES ON CAREER TRAJECTORY
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Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
The research questions were:

1. What perceived barriers, if any, exist that prevent LGB-identified seasoned student affairs officers from becoming senior-level administrators?

2. According to LGB-identified student affairs officers, what services and/or support systems (e.g., staff support groups, staff council for LGB awareness) exist on campus that pertain to LGB staff members?

3. Based on perceptions of the self and career trajectory for LGB-identified student affairs officers, what experiences have provided the most opportunities for career advancement?

4. What, if any, types of discrimination do LGB-identified student affairs officers say they have faced on their campus because of their sexual orientation?

Methodology and Design
This study consisted of a purposeful sample of LGB-identified student affairs professionals who work or have worked at public universities in the state of California. The study was qualitative in nature and explored the careers of LGB-identified student affairs professionals who are "out" on their campuses. The participants were asked a series of questions about their career paths and the challenges and triumphs that led them to their current positions. The sample population was sought from the researcher’s personal connections with members who are affiliated with the Western Association of College and University Housing Officers (WACUHO).

The staff members in this study have 7 years or more of professional experience in student affairs and are at a level of department director or above, because those with less experience in student affairs are unlikely to have the career mobility of those in midlevel or director-level positions. Also, choosing staff members who work at similar public institutions allowed for some of the intervening variables to be constant, thus those individuals who participated in the study experienced similar campus climates.

Participants
There were a total of 15 (n = 15) participants, who chose a pseudonym, and self-identified their gender, sexual orientation, and years of full-time work in student affairs. To maintain confidentiality of the participants, the researcher chose not to reveal the executive positions participants held in student affairs. Most of the participants were gay men (n = 10), and the position of director represented the largest portion of the group (n = 10). Four serve in the associate vice president/chancellor role, and one as an assistant dean of students. In terms of years of experience, the group ranged from 8 to 39 years of full-time experience in student affairs. With regard to ethnicity, they identified across the spectrum: White (n = 6), Latino/a (n = 3), African American (n = 3), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 2), and Middle Eastern (n = 1).

Findings
The findings in this study suggest that LGB-identified student affairs professionals are able to achieve the career path that they choose. Additionally, according to the participants in this study, there have been few to no barriers to prevent them from moving up the career ladder to achieve leadership positions on their campuses. Surprisingly, in some cases, participants indicated that their sexual orientation actually helped them in advancing in departments that sought a diverse pool of candidates. According to one, he felt that being "out" allowed him to be "more authentic and more relaxed and more open that then made me more approachable to students."

While changes have occurred with regard to perception of LGB-identified professionals, a number of issues still preclude them from living and working in any state they choose. Sexual orientation is only one layer of the multiple identities one carries on a daily basis, and some people are still working in environments where they are judged based on perceived abilities based on their sexual orientation. To date, many states do not provide protections against the discrimination of LGB individuals. In some states, LGB-identified individuals can be fired from their jobs for no cause other than their sexual orientation (Human Rights Campaign, 2012). Further, there are current outstanding court decisions in some states regarding same-sex marriage and domestic partner benefits. This climate provides numerous challenges for colleges and universities that wish to recruit and retain talented faculty and staff members who may also be LGB-identified.

* Generally, the letters LGB are followed by T referring to transgender individuals. For the purposes of this study, only sexual orientation was a factor.
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Best practices for serving indigenous students can meaningfully transform higher education theory and practice. For the most part, institutions have paid little attention to indigenous student success because of this group’s underrepresentation in higher education. Native participation in higher education has increased in the past 30 years: however, it represents only 1% of the college population (Aud et al., 2011). An institution may not realize it has a Native population on campus because of the sheer diversity of Native Americans (Shotton, Lowe, & Waterman, 2013). Not all Native students look alike, and they are not exclusively located in U.S. Southwest; not all reside on a reservation, pow-wow, or speak Native languages. Yet we have found that the best practices we use to support our diverse Native students are the same practices that can benefit all students. We begin by providing our approach to serving Native students and explain the Family Education Model, sharing examples from our experiences as scholar-practitioners.

As practitioners, we approach our work with Native students by first treating them with compassion and respect. We assume that all students bring gifts with them to college. We recognize they have varying strengths (many of which may not be immediately evident), come from a variety of backgrounds and communities, and lead lives outside of college. We value the rich cultures and phenomenal knowledge systems from which these students descend. We urge patience and allow for students to share information at their own pace in order to build trust; we know that when students trust us, we are better able to support them. We understand that students communicate their needs or issues in a variety of ways, so we must pay close attention. Asking too many questions may make the student uncomfortable, but we also know frank conversations are sometimes necessary. We respect the students as individuals but also as parts of a community. Sometimes they come from contested Native communities and Native identities (not all Native communities are governmentally recognized, nor can all students “prove” Native identity—these are topics for another time).
Above all, Native students attend college to succeed just like non-Native students do. This does not mean a student has broken away from home or has abandoned his or her culture and family. They are still primarily first-generation students (Aud et al., 2011). While their families may not always understand the college experience, they are supportive. Like non-Native students, Native students go to college to get away from home; however, Native family networks (which can be extensive) can be those students' greatest strength.

We find HeavyRunner and DeCelles' (2002) Family Education Model (FEM) central in terms of reframing our collective approach to structuring and implementing higher education for all students. They found that retention among Native students centered on replicating the extended family structure within the institution. Creating a mirror of the extended family in higher education provides Native students with a greater sense of belonging through engaging family members and community support networks in the educational process. Essentially, we believe surrounding our students with holistic support—as a healthy extended family would—is key to holistic success in higher education.

When planning a student and family orientation luncheon at Syracuse University, we did not limit “family” to parents because we knew “family” could mean parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, siblings, and close friends; they are considered family. Conceivably, 12 people could attend the luncheon for 1 student. We want those 12 people to be involved in our student’s success. Understanding the strengths of our families is important and can also lead to family-oriented educational programming.

At Native Hawaiian Student Services at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, FEM has been a helpful guide for building and analyzing our work. The core for our students is their ʻohana (extended family), so it is essential for us to build strong relationships with families and communities. We encourage building ʻohana structures on campus, inviting ʻohana to campus, and working with ʻohana in communities. In our little way, we attempt to decentralize higher education and increase accessibility by building respectful and lasting relationships with our communities through multiple community-based projects. We know that our communities hold immense wealth.

As illustrated above, our approach in working with Native students and their families can be a helpful guide in building healthy learning environments for all students. The Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion competency asks us not only to learn about diverse cultures and their intersections but also to create environments that support continuous learning and welcome all students and their families (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2010). If we think about the spirit of the family and its importance to student success, we recognize that extended families exist everywhere, not just in communities of color or among people genealogically connected, and they bring with them immense knowledge and wisdom (Association of College Unions International, 2009). In turn, Native students and their families provide us with valuable lessons on how we may build similar networks of support on our college campuses in order to create healthy educational environments and encourage success for all students.
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Centenary College of Louisiana, founded in 1825, is the oldest chartered liberal arts college west of the Mississippi River. In August 2014, it charted new territory for short-term study abroad programs by sending its entire freshman class to the same country, together, for 10 days. Nationally, 51.5% of students who studied abroad during the 2011–2012 academic year did so either during a period of 8 weeks or less (Institute of International Education, 2013), showing that this shorter-term format is popular for study abroad programs at many colleges and universities. However, a short-term study abroad program that allows for an entire cohort to travel together simultaneously and to participate in course work for academic credit is rare in undergraduate education.

With the support of local government officials, college alumni, and current faculty and staff members, the Centenary in Paris program was planned to send new first-year students to Paris, France, to study abroad before the fall semester would even begin (Rivard, 2013). One of the many benefits of the Centenary in Paris program was that it gave every member of the entering class the opportunity to study in Paris as part of a larger 19-day intensive August immersion course. By creating this program, the college also aimed to help students learn how to navigate the academic college environment and to develop a more global perspective. International study was not only a goal in and of itself but also a vehicle for incorporating practices that promote overall success, learning, and retention (Tinto, 2007). As Astin (1993) and others (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) have uncovered, students who engage with others—especially their peers and faculty members—experience greater growth in college. To guide these efforts, high-impact education practices (Kuh, 2008) are embedded within this program’s DNA. The high-impact practices include not only global learning but also:

- First-year seminars and experiences: The Centenary in Paris program was created to give first-year students a new opportunity not only to explore one of the world’s largest and most historical cities but also to learn with and from one another as they seek to grow intellectually.
- Common intellectual experiences: Each immersion course was designed around one of three Global Challenges, which are broad themes that cut across and integrate the core curriculum, first-year experience courses, and residential learning communities at Centenary College.
- Collaborative assignments and projects: Each course included opportunities for students to work together and complete specific graduation requirements.
The Centenary in Paris program was a collaboration between faculty members and student affairs professionals. The provost, vice provost, and dean of students began developing plans for an international first-year experience after an August immersive term was added to the college calendar in 2013. Paris was identified as a potential site because of the college’s longstanding historical ties and relationship with France. Three faculty directors were appointed to develop this new idea: the chair of the French department (an honorary diplomatic representative of the French government) and two other professors who have led short-term study abroad courses to Paris each year for more than a decade. The college’s dean of students coordinated the overall experience, while the director of global engagement provided research and expertise to ensure that the program met best practices in the areas of international education and risk management.

Additional professors began developing disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses, leveraging Paris as a learning laboratory. A brief faculty and staff preparation trip to Paris was held in May 2014. This trip gave faculty members an opportunity to finalize their course syllabi, learn from peers who had lived and taught in Paris, and cultivate a greater understanding of the cultural norms of the country where they would be teaching. Meetings were also arranged during this trip with local educators at university partners in France to garner their expertise.

A rigorous immersive course offering combined with international travel posed a significant challenge to students in their first week of college, as most of the students had never left the United States and some had never been on an airplane. To combat this concern, a high level of support was provided prior to and during the trip, beginning with the college’s Summer Orientation and Registration (SOAR) program in June 2014. During the two-day SOAR program, students and parents were given an overview of what they could expect during the experience, including information on academic expectations, safety, and traveling abroad. Through the remainder of the summer, students and parents received information online regarding academic, financial, social, and cultural expectations. By July, students were communicating with their professors and were assigned readings and assignments to prepare them for their coursework. Just before starting in August, students participated in a fall orientation program where they also received general cultural training and an intercultural competency pretest (Chen & Starosta, 2000) as part of an embedded extensive student assessment initiative.

Ninety-three percent of the first-year students who were admitted by August elected to participate in the Centenary in Paris program. Overall, 126 students traveled to Paris as part of the inaugural year of the program. Sixteen faculty and staff members, including the college’s president, accompanied the students. As part of the college’s commitments to its students, students earned 4 four academic credit hours before the traditional fall semester began. During the program, students’ activities varied by course, as they were split into sections of 12 to 13 students per professor. Students learned to use the city’s Metro system, rather than taking tour buses, and resided at the FIAP Jean-Monett, a modern 500-bed hostel in the heart of the city, where they were able to interact with young people from France and around the world.

Upon returning home to campus, courses continued for another week. Experiential learning opportunities were offered in each course, often comparing an element of Paris with the community of Shreveport, Louisiana, where the college is located. The experience culminated with an exhibit in the college’s nationally accredited art museum, which combined Paris-related art from the museum’s permanent collection with the students’ art, writing, and reflections. This exhibit gave the campus community and the students’ families a way to experience Paris through the eyes of the participants. Some of the desired outcomes of this program include an increase in the engagement and persistence of first-year students, greater global awareness and intercultural competency for students, and an increase in students’ desires to go abroad again for a longer period of time later in their college careers.
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More Latina/o students are enrolling in postsecondary education—and at a pace greater than that of White students (Fry & Taylor, 2013). However, compared with other student populations, Latina/os tend to enroll in a disproportionately small number of institutions. In 2012–2013, nearly 60% of Latina/os enrolled in just 11% of postsecondary institutions—namely Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) (Calderón Galdeano & Santiago, 2014). HSIs are defined as institutions with 25% or more total undergraduate Latina/o full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment (Higher Education Act, 2008). Although the official HSI designation is given at the undergraduate level, additional attention is being paid to the role these institutions play in increasing Latina/o student success at the graduate level. In 2012–2013, there were 370 HSIs in the United States and Puerto Rico, of which 139 (38%) offered graduate degrees (Calderón Galdeano & Santiago, 2014). Because one of the goals of higher education is
to increase student success at every level, HSIs continue to show their dedication to the communities they serve by essentially developing their own administrators and faculty, and awarding 32% of all Hispanic graduate degrees (Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, 2013).

Along the Texas-Mexico border, eight universities have steadily increased the numbers of Latina/o master’s and doctoral graduates; however, this was not always the case. Prior to 1987, appropriations to universities along that border were much less than they were in other areas of the state. This discrepancy led the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund to file a pair of class action lawsuits claiming inequities for higher education funding along the Texas-Mexico border (Oliva, 2002; Olivas, 2005). Specifically, at the time of the lawsuits, only 2 of the 589 doctoral programs in Texas were offered in this region (Valencia, 2008). The ensuing public political debate over the needs of these border institutions drew the attention of state legislators. The result was the passage of the 1989 South Texas/Border Initiative (STBI) and increased funding to these eight institutions. By examining the policy’s origins and its impact on graduate programming on eight HSIs along the Texas-Mexico border, this article presents key findings from a larger study of the STBI.

Methodology
To gain insight into the passage and implementation of the STBI and its relationship to the access and success of Latina/o graduate students, a descriptive case study research design (Creswell, 2007) was selected. This method of policy analysis allowed for examination into the racial inequality that existed within the state of Texas in relation to higher education funding. Purposeful sampling was used to recruit the three groups of participants: attorneys who filed the lawsuits, state legislators who brought forward the STBI legislation, and university presidents who implemented the state policies. Together, the participants were able to make the claims for social justice and highlighted the rampant disparities in higher education funding for institutions in south Texas, of which all were HSIs and where the majority of Latina/o students in Texas were enrolled.

Selected Major Findings
Donato and Lazerson (2002) discussed the importance of educational histories of people of color and how this field continues to be insufficiently explored. To enrich the field, this study makes two important contributions to the body of knowledge. The first is insight into the policy process within the Texas legislature, as seen in the STBI, by conducting a policy analysis at all levels: lawsuit, legislation, and implementation. The second contribution aims to increase focus on these universities along the Texas-Mexico border that may have smaller programs but that are making a large impact on the number of Latina/o scholars earning graduate degrees.

Litigation continues to be an instrument of social reform. The lawsuit served as a catalyst for the STBI, as it publicized the disparity and unequal treatment by the Texas legislature to this area of the state. While litigation can help highlight an issue, systemic change comes from a group of participants working together to effect change from both inside and out. A truly unique aspect of the STBI was how so many legislators, community leaders, litigators, and university presidents worked together to help the entire Texas-Mexico border area. The grassroots efforts and unity among the various stakeholders resulted in the development of legislation that improved the academic and economic environment along the Texas-Mexico border.

The STBI provided additional monies for scholarships, faculty salaries and, most important, program development. As of 2010, the universities along the Texas-Mexico border had 60 doctoral programs and 357 master’s programs—an increase from 2 and 218 in 1989, respectively—thus increasing educational opportunities to students in south Texas and allowing them to stay in the communities where many of them lived and worked. In 2010–2011, these eight institutions awarded 40% of all graduate degrees to Latina/os in Texas. Nationally, three of the top five institutions awarding master’s degrees to Latina/os in the 2011–2012 academic year were STBI institutions (Santiago & Calderón Galdeano, 2014).

Implications for Policy and Practice
This study has three major implications. First, lessons learned from the key players in the formation and implementation of this legislation show how stakeholders can come together within the legislative process to address inequities in higher education and to increase the number of Latina/o graduate students and, consequently, the representation of Latina/o faculty and administrators in higher education. Three key strategies were engaged simultaneously and with multiple players, which affected the movement of the STBI legislation: legal, political, and social.

Second, higher education officials need to understand that the policy process is not linear. There are many moving parts, and they have to be aware of the political and social climates, be actively involved, continue to develop relationships, and always be ready with various solutions. Finally, as the main higher education destination for Latina/o students, understanding how HSIs work with students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels has become increasingly important to help meet workforce needs and national degree attainment goals. Programs that allow students to stay in their home communities can help develop leaders who may likely understand the culture, community, and constituent needs.
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Among student affairs practitioners, multiculturalism and multicultural competency are now expected skills and knowledge areas of a well-rounded professional. The core elements of student affairs focus on inclusivity and a respect for individual and group differences. These differences lead to spirited discussions, debates, and dialogues on our campuses, yet most student affairs professionals do not have adequate training to face and address multiculturalism through an authentic voice.

What are the goals of multiculturalism? Banks (1995) wrote that the major goal of multicultural education is reform. This reform is necessary so that students from different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic statuses can experience educational equality. Gender equality is also a main tenet of multiculturalism, yet race and ethnicity tend to be the dominant areas of focus. The overarching goal of reform includes an overhaul of traditional curricula, systems, and attitudes.

The idea of multicultural competency was first introduced by Sue et al. (1982) in the field of counseling. Counselors need to be culturally aware, and they must be able to articulate that awareness if they expect to connect with a client who differs from them culturally. Pope and Reynolds (1997) proposed that for student affairs practitioners, multicultural competence includes 33 characteristics, which fall into three unique categories: multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills. Awareness focuses on the individual’s situated environment. An example includes reflection on the role of the parents and the language they use when referring to persons of color, and how this may lead to concerns of racism. Knowledge includes those elements that advance our understanding of a topic. This might include an opportunity for true engagement, such as a workshop or forum on racial bias or hate speech, where one’s own understanding of a particular issue can be furthered. Skills are specific remedies that individuals develop for a situation they become familiar with, such as confronting an act of intolerance in a residence hall.

On our campuses, men play a critical role in enhancing multicultural competence and leadership. Anderson (2009) discussed this concept quite clearly when he lays out that multiple masculinities really pertain to a shift from “traditional,” hegemonic masculinity (laced with themes of dominance, misogyny, and homophobia) toward a more
inclusive model of masculinity, where there exists a greater amount of room for “nontraditional” masculinity, which favors collaboration and social interaction.

Young professionals may acquire a certain level of awareness and knowledge in the classroom, but are they learning effective methods to work with the very students they are studying? Are men stepping up and serving as a voice for inclusivity, for compassion, and for justice? Young professionals, fresh out of their master’s programs, simply have not learned enough about their own awareness and knowledge, and many have yet to develop a set of skills to combat or address multiculturalism issues. Our growth and understanding comes from within, as well as from our environment. The connections between multiculturalism and multiple masculinities enhance the dialogue and allow for a broader, more encompassing discussion among men and women, young and old.

Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller (2004) showed that multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills are essential components of one’s professional development. They remind us that “although not all student affairs practitioners will become experts in multicultural issues . . . every student affairs professional must have a level of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills that allows them to competently work with diverse groups of students and colleagues” (p. 9).

Male student affairs practitioners are given the tools through coursework in their curricula and are expected to then practice what they have been taught. Unfortunately, these same men—more often than not, White male administrators—rarely participate in dialogues on race despite carrying the necessary tools to become thoughtful, skilled practitioners in the dialogue. Again, a shift toward using one’s inclusive masculinity framework as a vehicle for change seems to be an obvious opportunity, but it is often the last discussion invoked on campus, because masculinity is seen as a construct impossible to alter in our society.

Professional development remains an important component of most student affairs opportunities, whether through conferences, workshops, memberships, or subscriptions. Often, these opportunities give practitioners the chance to demonstrate, through the presentation of programs or best practices, their commitment. We must also take advantage of opportunities to connect with paraprofessionals in our communities to demonstrate sound and reliable practice. A focus on continued professional development at all levels remains at the foundation of strong student affairs programs. A practical, programmatic focus on multicultural development should be the case for all student affairs programs.

Informal dialogue with colleagues and students is one way to further enhance discussions on race and privilege. These dialogues can be organized through a mentor/mentee format—for example, a lunch-and-learn session, where colleagues come together to discuss relevant articles. Discussions about local, state, and federal legislation can also open doors for understanding differences and commonalities.

Masculinity means more than dominance or a true hegemonic display of what it means to be a man. Men must use their positions on campus and within student affairs to reach a broader audience and to embrace an inclusive, ongoing dialogue on diversity and multiculturalism, however challenging. We must encourage the difficult dialogues, and we must promote social justice—we need to demonstrate it in our displays of fairness, consensus building, and inclusivity—to all students, not just men, on our campuses.

Formal training and professional development opportunities for professionals and paraprofessionals through lectures, departmental assessments, and curricula show a department’s commitment to the dialogue and development. Of course, speakers, assessments, and curricula go only so far: the organization truly has to “walk the talk,” which means encouraging discussion and debate around these topics regularly as well as providing safe places for understanding. Study circles hosted within communities have also proven to be helpful in opening discussions.

Men must step forward to be change agents in higher education. Instead, men often wait for others to take action and fail to capitalize on their own opportunity to step forward and act. Young practitioners need to learn early in their careers that their voices are powerful and that they do matter. Mid- and senior-level practitioners need to demonstrate through their own actions that they can be the voice for all, and the agents of change we need.
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All student affairs professionals face challenges in their work, and how they actually experience those challenges varies according to many factors, among them racial identity. Student affairs professionals of color feel and discuss tacit rules and pressures to take on the bulk of social justice and diversity work at predominantly White institutions (PWIs; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). Student affairs professionals of color often find themselves navigating the unfair burden of racial representation based on how they are outwardly perceived (Almirall-Padamsee, 1999). Although this concept is heavily explored in literature pertaining to faculty and students of color at PWIs (Felder & Barker, 2013; Harper et al., 2011; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001), few sources that discuss these same impacts on student affairs professionals of color exist. Such professionals are often challenged, or feel an obligation, to represent and “speak for” their communities in ways their White colleagues are not (Bondi, 2012; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). This may result in burnout and feelings of professional and personal isolation. In order to create a supportive and inclusive environment, the impact of race on student affairs professionals’ work must be acknowledged.

As a socially constructed concept, race is deeply embedded in social, cultural, and political structures (Patton, McEwen, Rendon, & Howard-Hamilton, 2007). Ignoring its influence denies the systemic complexities and disadvantages that student affairs professionals of color may face. Critical Race Theory (CRT) has been used as a framework to examine and better appreciate the complex dynamics, intersections, and impacts of race. CRT was developed to better understand and give voice to those stories that fell outside of traditional narratives, which often lacked experiences of specific racial groups (Patton et al., 2007).

Emerging research shows higher-than-average levels of generalized anxiety disorder among people of color, particularly African Americans, owing to a constant barrage of discrimination (Nauert, 2011). This discrimination can show itself in different ways, such as racial microagressions. The reality has been given the name racial battle fatigue (RBF; Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). This same concept can be applied to the experiences of student affairs professionals of color. RBF manifests itself in physiological and psychological symptoms, including frustration, anger, tension headaches, anxiety, fatigue, helplessness, and fear (Smith et al., 2007).

To further explore the pressures student affairs practitioners of color experience and to understand some of these effects, a multi-institutional, open-ended survey was conducted. We solicited participants via listservs and social media. Participants were allowed to self-select eligibility, and they were asked to identify their race and gender identity. Of 15 survey respondents, 6.67% self-identified as mestizo, 26.67% as White, and 66.67% as African American/Black. Beyond racial/ethnic identity, sexuality was a demographic considered, and over 26.67% of respondents identified within the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans*, Queer, Intersex & Asexual (LGBTQIA) community. The survey did not inquire into the type of institution with which the respondents were affiliated, but many of the respondents disclosed an affiliation with PWIs.

Nearly all 15 respondents affirmed that they had been asked to speak on behalf of their racial identity and community. Participants remarked that this responsibility led to feelings of alienation and tokenization on campus.
Participants shared the following anonymous thoughts:

"I have been and it made me laugh but sad that someone thought that I would be qualified to speak on behalf of the entire African American community."

"I felt very angry that I was expected to speak on behalf of a group that I, as a single person, could not possibly represent holistically, because we are a diverse group with varied experiences."

"I was uncomfortable. I felt as if I had to respond appropriately or it would either add to the perception the group had about my racial group, or I would be seen as not knowledgeable of what was asked of me."

"I am constantly forced to think about what makes me palatable to the majority rather than just allowing myself to be."

Respondents’ remarks frequently reflected feelings of burnout, isolation, stress, and lack of professional support. All respondents spoke to the lack of campus and departmental support as student affairs professionals of color, including a lack of spaces on campus to talk about their experiences.

The data collected were rich in detail and add to the literature on student affairs professionals of color. This study had several limitations, among them the low number of respondents and that the majority of the respondents identified as Black/African American. Expanding the survey to include a wider diversity of participants and conducting verbal qualitative, follow-up interviews would enrich the findings and possibly provide a better understanding of the lived experiences of student affairs professionals of color across race, regions, and institutions.

Based on these findings, it must be acknowledged that racial identity affects the experiences of student affairs professionals. It is important to consider how to create spaces of support and how to best foster a work environment of inclusivity. The first step is acknowledging that there are varied experiences. Taking the time to check in with staff of color is vital. Are there intentional and safe spaces in your department, functional area, or institution to have such conversations? Student affairs professionals need to intentionally assess their workspaces and how they support communities—of which they may not be a part—to discover how to best support all of our colleagues in their continued success.
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Professionals providing services in higher education should make a commitment to uphold shared ethical principles, for the benefit of students, the student affairs profession, and higher education (Kitchener, 1985). Similarly, the personal foundations competency promotes holistic self-awareness and development that undergirds professional practice (ACPA & NASPA, 2010). Competent professionals in these areas continuously focus on embracing and evolving the higher education landscape by continuously engaging in self-assessment to authentically integrate philosophies of service, development, and student learning into their practices. When professionals incorporate these competencies into their practice, program quality, student development, and excellence are enhanced, ultimately serving college students and the institution in a more refined and established purpose (ACPA & NASPA, 2010; Humphrey, Janosik, & Creamer, 2004).

According to Maya Angelou, “Courage may be the most important of all the virtues because without it one cannot practice any other virtue with consistency” (Tate, 1983, p. 11). As the chief virtue, courage is an ethical construct that includes elements of bravery, persistence, integrity, and vitality (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). For new professionals establishing themselves in the field, developing the competencies of personal foundations and ethical professional practice begins with courage. Several factors—including lack of self-efficacy and low perception of supervisory support—may hinder the new professional’s socialization and even contribute to his or her departure from the profession (Renn & Hodges, 2007; Tull, 2006). In a sense, new professionals are like novice swimmers: they have learned all of the elements of swimming—breathing, floating, kicking, and stroking—and must combine these elements in order to swim into their roles with courage.

**The Courage to Breathe**

Take a deep breath. Now describe that action. Breathing is a natural, common action; when it occurs involuntarily, we aren’t thinking about the complicated, intricate nature of the respiratory system. Similarly, understanding one’s personal foundations and ethics can easily be ignored, even though these factors are guiding our practice. Our awareness of them, along with courage, is essential to performing at an optimal level. Learning and challenging the epistemology of ethics gives one the ability to question what knowledge is, how it can be acquired, and how it can play a role in confronting ethical dilemmas. Reestablishing
ethics as it pertains to the professional’s new role will help him or her find congruence between the role and his or her ethical duty to do no harm, be just, respect autonomy, and benefit others (Kitchener, 1985).

The Courage to Float
F intentionally yet learned, as one becomes accustomed to the buoyancy. Similarly, learning the institutional environment is the practice of becoming accustomed to the unknowns of new roles, new cultures, and the profession. Magolda (1999) advocated for using ethnographic methods, namely observations and interviews, to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the dynamic interplay between environments and human behavior. In learning the environment, new professionals effectively learn how to “float” in understanding how their role is tied to institutional priorities and needs. Concurrently, new professionals also learn how their institutions “float” in their operations and success measures.

The Courage to Kick From the Hip
When a swimmer kicks from the hip, he or she mimics the flow of the water and propels forward. Student affairs professionals use a variety of techniques to move forward in performing their job responsibilities. New professionals learning how to kick from the hip may lack confidence; courage is particularly important here, as they need to overcome their fear in order to respond to institutional needs. A new professional’s interventions are based on his or her understanding of the institutional context in which he or she works. A new professional is becoming familiar with his or her role and fit within the institution (Renn & Hodges, 2007; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). This “kicking from the hip” takes time and practice but must be intentional and the result of a comprehensive understanding of the environment.

The Courage to Stroke
Stroking propels and guides the body through water. The activity itself is a rhythmic and coordinated process involving all body parts. Similarly, new professionals are guided by institutional mission, vision, and values in student affairs. Understanding and supporting institutional missions can help guide practitioners toward being successful. The idea behind the strategic planning process helps one do a better job at focusing resources toward a common goal. Each stroke pushes through resistance, toward a defined and constructed effort, which guides and shapes actions toward a specific “how,” “what,” and “why” that focuses on the future (Bryson, 2004).

The Courage to Swim
The experienced swimmer appears to effortlessly glide through water, incorporating all of the elements—breathing, floating, kicking from the hip, and stroking—into his or her form and making adjustments as needed. New student affairs professionals must learn and relearn, making adjustments as they understand responsibilities and respond to institutional needs. And they must have the courage, action despite fear, to learn how each element—breathing, floating, kicking, stroking, swimming—works in isolation and in concert with the other elements.

The theme of the 2015 NASPA Annual Conference is “Navigating With Courage,” stemming from the increased demand for accountability and change in higher education. Student affairs professionals with a personal foundation of courage are critical for making decisions, for assessing learning environments, and for developing interventions to meet these needs (Humphrey et al., 2004). For new professionals and graduate students, the conference can be the beginning of this foundation of ethical professional practice. Navigate the conference with courage as you develop your competencies, and before you know it, you might be swimming.
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For centuries, universities educated their students in loco parentis (Latin for “in the place of a parent”), with the university becoming the caretaker of a student and taking on the responsibilities of a parent (Garner, 2009). This relationship allowed universities to regulate the personal lives of their students and, when necessary, discipline them without concern for their right to due process. Now the term could seem antiquated for modern institutions of higher education, as since the 1960s there has been a steady shift each year to bring families back into the picture (Lee, 2011).

The role of families in the student experience has always been difficult to define. Across the United States, institutions rely heavily on families to help get their children to our schools, yet then ask families to stay away and give those children a chance to grow independently. Research shows that this approach is illogical, unsupported, and ignorant of cultural differences. Arguably, parental involvement can be seen as a critical component of student success. White (2013) asserted, “Studies have found that parental engagement supports higher levels of student autonomy, higher levels of psychological adjustment and life satisfaction, and higher levels of participation in and satisfaction with college” (p. 1).

Now the question is: How do we shift the conversation and create ways for families to go from roles as mere co-signers for loans and emergency contacts to partners with an equal stake in their children’s education? This article proposes three broad-based tactics that can help student affairs professionals begin to reframe their perspective on parental involvement and offers some beginning strategies for how to initiate these tactics.

Shape the Path
Families are no longer driving to campus on orientation day, unloading belongings, snapping a few pictures, and then driving home for the year; they want to do something more. In the article, “Families: Help or Hindrance?” Grasgreen (2012) proposed that orientation programs should include time for campus officials to talk with families about how they can get involved and also what their boundaries should be. Student affairs professionals should communicate
with families before the first problem arises. If you shape the path for families and provide a clear vision, there is a greater likelihood that the relationship will be beneficial for everyone involved (Grasgreen, 2012).

There has been a steady shift in the way colleges and universities communicate with this generation of families (Evans, 2013). It is not uncommon to find such on-campus involvement as parent scholarships, fundraising efforts, a family day or weekend, families’ associations, or some combination of these programs. With these activities, colleges and universities have increased their communication between students and their families, resulting in an upsurge in family participation and interest in the school (Evans, 2013). Given this trend, it is our responsibility as practitioners in the field to help our institutions shape the involvement path for families in order to achieve positive interactions, while helping families to understand their role.

Find the Balance
Even within this changing institutional environment, a balance must be struck between the costs and benefits of parental involvement. “Often called ‘helicopter families’ because they ‘hover’ over the lives of their sons and daughters from preschool to college graduation, many of them are in fact reasonable and patient when dealing with the university” (Galsky & Shotick, 2012, p. 1). The media plays up the “helicopter parent” stereotype by showing examples of families calling colleges and universities to handle their child’s problems. Although this perception of parent involvement exists—and in some cases is true—the vast majority of our families are willing to help the school with recruitment strategies, internship and employer opportunities, or advisory boards (Galsky & Shotick, 2012). When families understand the institution’s goals for student learning and development, they can become key partners in making progress toward meeting those goals.

It is clear that families are an important presence in the lives of their students. An NPR study found that “40 percent of college students are in touch with families by phone, email, text or visit at minimum once a day” (Khrais, 2012). However, there is value in giving students autonomy and promoting their growth as adults and individuals, and families may be preventing their children from achieving authentic happiness by rushing in to save the day when a problem occurs (Hofer & Sullivan-Moore, 2010).

Student affairs professionals can work toward promoting this balance with families by encouraging students to make their own decisions and providing them with experiences and resources to enter adulthood. Institutions should develop relationships with families that provide hands-on opportunities for them to be involved through a structured experience in order to achieve balance. Everyone needs to find value as well as their role in the experience.

Develop Relationships
It is more important than ever that we educate and empower families to be a healthy part of the institutional setting. Over the next decade we can expect to see growing parent orientation programs, increased parent association involvement, and more staff dedicated to working with families at many of our institutions. As a partner in education, families can reinforce the importance of thriving on campus, assist in monitoring for early warning signs of mental distress, and work as partners to increase retention rates by helping their students see the value in earning a degree.

Moving Forward
Learning to work with and incorporate parent involvement into the mission of our practice is about reframing and reconsidering our approach. Instead of viewing families as a roadblock, student affairs professionals can utilize them as an integral campus resource. This effort revolves around shaping the path, finding the balance, and developing relationships with families. As institutional efforts continue to incorporate families into the college experience, it is the hope that student affairs professionals will as well. At the end of the day, we all have the same goal: to support student success.
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The "typical" college experience is not so typical anymore. Student affairs professionals are familiar with the influx of veterans, nontraditional students, and first-generation students, as well as a growing diversity within the student body. As professionals work to create and promote opportunities for students to become connected with their campus, local, and global communities, there are often invisible barriers for students. Specifically, a students' economic backgrounds may affect their paths to a degree. The Socioeconomic and Class Issues in Higher Education Knowledge Community aims to shine more light on issues that affect students who may be from low socioeconomic status backgrounds, to discuss ways to break barriers, and to route these students toward success.

Although higher education was once reserved only for those of greater means, it has become significantly more accessible in recent decades. With the introductions of the G.I. Bill and the Higher Education Act, student populations began to change and opportunities to obtain a college degree increased for people not born wealthy (Thelin, 2011). A degree led to a career and the realistic
chance of achieving the American dream (Mullen, 2011). Some argue that the American dream is dying, stacking the cards against those who have less and making the dream of success even more unrealistic (O’Brien, 2013). While debate about this idea continues, student affairs professionals must make a conscious effort to ensure college success is a reality for all students, no matter their socioeconomic status, and understand potential challenges that may lie ahead.

The college experience for students of different socioeconomic backgrounds is not always understood by student affairs professionals. From the beginning, the choice of attending college may be limited for a low socioeconomic status student. If given the opportunity to attend college, many consider only community colleges, regional institutions, or local campuses. For low socioeconomic status students, selecting a major may be driven less by their passion or skills, and more by what is believed to be an appropriate career move (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013). Low socioeconomic status students who do not consider other options may end up finding themselves in a college that is not a good fit for them, which could ultimately lead to a decision to drop out (White House, 2014).

Once they arrive at college, low socioeconomic status students lack the luxury of taking time to discover and develop the way traditional students do. Even the ritual of move-in can be isolating for these students. For example, as a case manager, I worked with a homeless student who had been living in shelters, who enrolled in his first semester at a mid-sized regional university. He opted to live in the residence hall, hoping to find a more supportive environment on campus rather than that of the shelter a bus ride away. When I, his case manager, walked into the room with him, there was already a definite, though invisible, line drawn down the room. On one side, his roommate’s posters hung on the walls, and there was a large TV with video game systems as well as a full mini-fridge. On the other side, my student had a duffle bag and one laundry basket full of all the clothes in his possession. That line acted as a visual metaphor for the main line he would face: the line between “the haves” and “the have-nots” on campus. Later, he decided to live off campus to save money. This decision drew him farther away from the campus environment, and he continued to struggle to engage and to connect to the proper channels to persist and succeed. While this is just one student’s story, this gap continues to widen for low socioeconomic status students.

Students without other options prioritize paying bills or supporting families, and thus sacrifice on-campus life. Often on-campus work positions do not pay as much or offer as many benefits as do positions off-campus. Accepting off-campus employment with a guaranteed 30 hours of work each week or an overnight job because it fits a student’s schedule may be the only viable option students have when on-campus positions are unable to meet their needs. Accepting a job may also mean giving up practica and internships, which would boost their resumes and lead to more opportunities in a career field (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013).

Every semester, most of the Federal TRiO Programs students I serve struggle with this very dilemma: making their academics fit into their work schedules. At least once every semester, I see a student who has planned the next 2 years with a perfect balance of science and humanities have no choice but to rearrange this plan because the student is at the mercy of an employer. Amid planning schedules, we encourage them to take up opportunities to be involved in other ways on campus to prepare them; in reality, how can we expect students to properly balance their work demands against the luxury of development and “finding themselves” in college?

Beyond the first year, graduation rates for low socioeconomic status students are much lower than those of their wealthier counterparts. By age 25, 1 in 10 people coming from low-income families will have a bachelor’s degree, compared with 5 in 10 from high-income families (White House, 2014). The reasons students do not finish college range from economic, cultural, and social to institutional concerns (Tinto, 2007). Economic reasons for departure arise when students feel the costs outweigh the benefits. This could occur when a student no longer can pay for college, when he or she must pay bills rather than spend money on books or tuition, or when a student finds more financial stability through marriage or family. Other reasons for leaving may be intuitionally related, such as the uncertainty of navigating the college environment, lack of remedial classes, or a general disconnect from the intuition. Some low socioeconomic status students may leave for social or cultural reasons, such as family obligations or a lack of integration the student feels with the institution (Braxton, 2003).

We cannot be afraid to examine our own institutions and practices with consideration for students of a different socioeconomic status. While trying to keep costs low for students on the alternative spring break trip, is there a means to provide scholarships or fundraising opportunities for students unable to afford it? Do fundraising efforts conflict with possible work schedules? What kind of accommodations are offered for students without a place to go during breaks when residence halls close? Some solutions may be easy to implement, while others may take more time.

In the student affairs profession, we have seen progress toward providing resources for low socioeconomic status students and expanding our knowledge of these populations. Helping low-income students is more than offering financial aid; in many schools, food insecurity is being acknowledged and combated with student food...
pantries and vouchers (Bahrampour, 2014). Many schools employ student success coaches and mentors (Marcus, 2013). First-generation students are reached out to with programs like TRiO; however, as with an ever-evolving student population, our work should continue to evolve as we explore the issues of how class and socioeconomic status affect students pursuing college degrees.

In discussions with colleagues, suggestions to supervisors, and proposed changes to committees and administration, student affairs professionals who advocate for low socioeconomic status students must understand the responsibility they always carry with them. As more schools pledge to help low-income students (Paulson, 2014), it may fall upon student affairs professionals to hold colleges and programs accountable. While schools have reached out and shown support to low-income students through aid, one-on-one support is often needed for these students to succeed in college (Lopez, 2014). As advocates, we must ensure that these students are getting the required resources. Although additional research is needed, there has been a push to promote this need for evidence-based practices regarding students and their financial struggles. One such example is professional development opportunities for student affairs personnel, such as the first National Summit on Financial Wellness held at The Ohio State University in July 2014; it brought together student affairs practitioners, policymakers, and researchers on this topic (The Ohio State University, n.d.).

We hope you will join us in the Socioeconomic and Class Issues in Higher Education Knowledge Community. Formed this year, this knowledge community aims to be a resource for all student affairs professionals by disseminating information on advocating for the persistence of low socioeconomic status students and working to understand the causes of these inequalities, the systems that maintain them, and the resources to fight them. With empowered professionals, we believe change across institutions and the field of higher education is possible.
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The Problem
Each year students struggle with a number of issues as they develop and grow during their time in college. A major issue facing these students relates to their sense of their own spirituality. To acclimate to campus culture, some students choose to become members of Greek-letter sororities and fraternities, whose traditions of friendship, sisterhood or brotherhood, and loyalty appeal to many students. However, problems arise when students’ religious views differ from the predominant religious views of these organizations. This article explores the unique issue of Jewish students in primarily Christian-based Greek-letter organizations, and it offers recommendations for colleges and universities to better support these students.

"Nationwide, roughly one-quarter to one-third of all college students in the United States belong to a Greek-letter society” (Horowitz, 2013, p. 27). Thus, Greek life has the potential to impact student development among a significant portion of the college population. An often unexamined aspect of collegiate learning is spiritual development, yet it is a vital part of a student’s life throughout college and critical to whole student learning (Love & Talbot, 2005).

Methodology
The study investigated 16 students’ perceptions of their experience on three college campuses in the western United States, which are known for their residential communities. The study sought to find how an identification as both Jewish and Greek affects a student’s college experience. Through inquiry-based evidence gathering, eight questions were asked in an effort to answer the overarching question: How do Jewish students involved in Greek life develop throughout college in historically Christian-based organizations?

Results
The 16 students interviewed brought to light a number of implications for the different spiritual development schemes of Jewish students in fraternities and sororities, and they offered ideas on how colleges can better serve them. These suggestions fall into four categories: Jewish Identification, Support System, Place of Worship, and Greek Life Student Development.

Jewish Identification
Students identify with Judaism either as their religion or as the culture of their heritage. Student affairs professionals need to create open environments where students can discuss how they identify. This decision to identify with the cultural or the religious side of his or her heritage can create an internal struggle. Choosing to identify as only culturally Jewish can affect the student’s pathway within the college, as the faith he or she grew up with no longer has the same value and influence it once did.

Support Systems
Peer. Peers affect the college experience greatly, so creating a support network is crucial to the success of students and student affairs. Student affairs professionals
also must be cognizant of their interactions with Jewish students to ensure adequate sensitivity to religious and cultural needs. Ensuring that judgmental comments, inappropriate jokes, or naïve statements toward Jewish students do not occur in the educational environment is of utmost importance.

**Student services.** Colleges and universities need to have an active presence of a Jewish leader on the university campus. Whether this is a staff member or a rabbi from the local community, someone should both advocate for and support Jewish students. Additionally, school dining services need to include kosher options. Students reported that administrators had stated that vegetarian options were appropriate; however, Jewish students should have the right to choose to eat kosher.

**Academic.** Colleges and universities need to consider assisting students so that they can observe religious holidays without academic penalty. For example, Rosh Hashanah is comparable to the Christian holiday of Christmas in terms of importance to the Jewish religion. Most Americans expect that Christmas is a chance to spend time as a family and even attend church; this level of understanding needs to be demonstrated toward Jewish holidays.

**Place of Worship**
Creating on campus an all-inclusive place of worship that maintains traditions of multiple faiths allows students the chance to practice those rituals they hold dear. Advertising not only lets students know about this opportunity but also makes them feel as though their faith is included and welcome on campus.

**Greek Life Student Development**
Maintaining ritual and tradition is vital to all Greek-letter organizations; however, adapting these traditions to possibly incorporate a Torah and a Bible should be considered. Initially, new member educators should explain the religious traditions of the organization. Members should be told that although some rituals might conflict with their personal views, the organization welcomes all faiths. Additionally, members should be encouraged and allowed to refrain from stating Bible verses and prayers when they do not feel comfortable. Student affairs professionals can also provide diversity workshops, which would promote an inclusive environment for the entire campus.

Overall, the study findings suggest the need for (a) institution support around the discussion of spiritual identity; (b) diversity training for faculty, students, and staff; (c) inclusive dining practices; (d) revisiting academic standards and perceptions to meet the needs of all faith traditions; (e) communication and collaboration with local places of worship; and (f) training for Greek-letter organizations about their founding ideals and ways to include all members.

The student interviews showed a richness of experiences and information that can change the field of higher education to make it more inclusive. Working to eliminate current ways of oppressing these students can create a better faculty, staff, and student population.
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Advancement staff have struggled to create connections and strategic partnerships with alumni who, historically, have felt disenfranchised on their campuses (Drezner, 2008, 2009, 2010; Gasman & Anderson-Thompkins, 2003; Gasman & Bowman, 2013). Most advancement officers use in their work fundraising and engagement models that were developed for wealthy, white, heterosexual men (Drezner, 2011). However, as financial giving from alumni declined in recent years throughout American higher education, development and alumni relations officers have attempted to recruit and retain donors whom they have not previously engaged (Drezner, 2013). One such group is lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) alumni.

LGBTQ alumni have unique college experiences that influence their attitudes toward their alma maters and toward giving (Garvey & Drezner, 2013; Sanlo, 2002). This is not surprising, given that scholars have documented the prevalence of discrimination on college campuses for LGBTQ students (Reason & Rankin, 2006).
For example, Rankin, Blumenfeld, Weber, and Frazer (2010) found that negative experiences for LGBTQ students ranged from subtle to extreme forms of discrimination. Among its discoveries, the report indicated that LGBTQ respondents experienced significantly higher amounts of harassment and discrimination while on campus than did their heterosexual and cisgender peers, leading them to develop negative feelings about their alma maters. Further, few campuses make thoughtful efforts to reach out to the LGBTQQ communities to gain insights into their philanthropic giving (Garvey & Drezner, 2013). Sanlo (2002) postulated that the combination of negative feelings toward their alma maters and the lack of engagement as alumni may decrease the likelihood of significant giving by LGBTQ alumni.

The National LGBT Alumni Survey

The National LGBT Alumni Survey (Garvey, 2013) was administered in spring 2014 and provides a national perspective on financial giving and volunteerism for LGBTQQ college and university alumni, with 3,183 participants representing all 50 U.S. states and Puerto Rico. The study population includes individuals who identify as LGBTQQ or another nonnormative sexual or gender identity and who received an undergraduate degree from an accredited nonprofit college or university.

The survey includes four distinct categories related to LGBTQQ alumni philanthropy: demographics, undergraduate student experiences, alumni experiences, and philanthropy and giving. Within the framework, five major latent factors influence LGBTQQ alumni giving. These latent factors were developed through empirical testing and were grounded in literature about LGBTQQ alumni giving (Drezner & Garvey, in press; Garvey & Drezner, 2013) and LGBTQQ campus climate (Rankin et al., 2010).

Preliminary descriptive results from the survey yield insights on patterns of giving and related predictors for alumni philanthropy. Among the total sample of LGBTQQ alumni, the mean and median response for total lifetime giving was between $50 and $100. Significant predictors of lifetime giving for LGBTQQ alumni include having an advanced degree, completing research with a professor, studying abroad, and perception of academic training as an undergraduate student. Regarding student involvement, lifetime giving for LGBTQQ alumni is positively influenced by participating in athletics, new student transition programs, social fraternities and sororities, student alumni associations/class giving committees, and leadership positions. Regarding LGBTQQ-specific contexts, there are several positive predictors of lifetime giving: belonging to an LGBTQQ support/counseling group, knowing “out” LGBTQQ faculty/staff, and having positive perceptions of the campus climate. Both work and financial dependency on guardians as an undergraduate negatively relate to lifetime giving for LGBTQQ alumni (Garvey, 2013).

Recommendations for Practice

Results from The National LGBT Alumni Survey and related literature on philanthropy among diverse alumni yield a number of practical implications for improving LGBTQQ alumni engagement and giving. In recent years, student affairs practitioners have been required to develop skills in fundraising and alumni relations (Puma, 2013; De Sawal & Maxwell, 2014). As such, the following implications offer recommendations for practitioners, specifically student affairs educators and advancement staff.

- Colleges and universities must facilitate a warm and safe campus climate for LGBTQQ students and alumni. In order to improve campus climate, student affairs practitioners may develop educational interventions that incorporate issues of social justice to reduce harassment and increase awareness within the classroom and on campus (see Johnson & Subasic, 2011, for examples). If institutions are unaware of students’ perceptions of campus climate, administrators may consider conducting climate and resource assessments for all diverse communities, including for LGBTQ individuals.

- Senior administrators should provide more targeted resources to student affairs educators and advancement staff regarding LGBTQQ identities and experiences. Both student affairs and advancement offices may consider consulting associations and reports related to LGBTQQ individuals in order to increase or improve training and resources that help them better understand sexual identity and gender identity and expression.

- Advancement staff must advocate for campus resources for LGBTQQ individuals. This effort will send a clear message to LGBTQQ alumni that the institution cares about the experiences of LGBTQQ students and alumni. Advancement staff may consider soliciting LGBTQ and ally alumni, parents, and friends for targeted gifts to benefit LGBTQQ communities.

- Demographic data collection for assessment and research should adequately capture the identities and experiences (both curricular and co-curricular) of LGBTQQ graduates so that these alumni may be identified for outreach and solicitation. Advancement offices should ask optional LGBTQQ demographic information on data forms and code them as such in records when alumni self-identify as LGBTQQ during cultivation or solicitation visits.

- Advancement staff should create and financially support LGBTQQ alumni affinity groups to increase engagement and potential donations. Alumni relations staff may consider developing programs and solicitations that recognize and celebrate salient identities of diverse alumni.
As institutions begin to realize that engaging disenfranchised alumni is important to expand their donor bases, advancement officers and student affairs staff need to think about how to engage both alumni and students more effectively and in culturally relevant ways. It is important to begin by creating a supportive campus climate while students are still on campus; however, reestablishing relationships with alumni who were disenfranchised in the past is an important step toward bringing them back into the university community.
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Elizabeth J. Whitt (2005) posited that “high-performing organizations are marked by partnerships, cross-functional collaborations, and responsive units” (p. 2) and suggested that “effective partnerships are among those who have the most contact with students—faculty and student affairs professionals—and fuel the collaborative spirit and positive attitude characterizing these campuses” (p. 2). In fall 2013, the Multicultural Mentoring Program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, fostered a cross-functional collaboration by implementing a new living and learning community into an existing peer-mentorship program.

Since its inception in 1986, the Multicultural Mentoring Program has played an integral role in the success and retention of students of color. Recent assessment feedback from students identified the need to strengthen the academic focus of the peer-mentoring program and to enhance the sense of community among first-year students of color—thus, the idea for a learning community was born. Kuh (2008) identified learning communities as formal programs where groups of students take two or more classes together, and categorized learning communities and first-year seminars and experiences as “high-impact practices.”
Brownell and Swaner (2009) elaborated further:

Participants in first-year seminars are more likely to report that their campus is a supportive environment . . . and that learning communities help ease the transition to college. Several studies of underserved students have shown that these communities help students build their identities as learners and give them a sense of belonging on campus. (p. 27)

Launched in fall 2014, the Multicultural Mentoring Program’s “Connect” Living and Learning Community provides students with a strong support system that also boasts academic enrichment, community-building, and campus engagement opportunities. The community’s goals are to:

- Promote academic excellence;
- Encourage community building and interpersonal connections; and
- Enhance student engagement and retention.

Wooten, Hunt, LeDuc, and Poskus (2012) suggested that institutions—while keeping students at the center of their missions—integrate peer-leadership programs to foster student growth and to support the educational process as a partnership among the various components of the campus community. In addition to being paired with an upper-class mentor to assist with the transition to college, community participants take a first-year seminar course and an English composition course together. On a monthly basis, students can engage in academic and professional development opportunities, network with university alumni and faculty, and develop interpersonal relationships with peers through meaningful social activities.

In its first year, the program received positive feedback from students within the learning community as well as from student affairs and academic affairs professionals; the latter groups have been partners in creating and implementing the community.

In The Student Learning Imperative, the American College Personnel Association boldly stated that “student affairs professionals [should] attempt to make ‘seamless’ what are often perceived by students to be disjointed, unconnected experiences by bridging organizational boundaries and forging collaborative partnerships with the faculty and others to enhance student learning” (ACPA, 1997, p. 3).

Seamless is the kind of approach that we sought when, in fall 2013, we began to put the pieces together for the Multicultural Mentoring Program’s “Connect” Living and Learning Community. Periodic meetings with colleagues in housing provided us with an opportunity to discuss potential challenges that might arise once the community was launched. Further, we were able to identify the methods that would be used to recruit students into the community and how we might proceed if the community did not reach the pilot target of 50 students. Consistent communication with the English department, First Year Studies Office, and the Registrar’s Office helped to ensure that students registered for the right courses in a timely fashion.

Careful thought went into how the resident assistant would interact with the four peer mentors, whom we refer to as “peer mentors-in-residence.” Peer mentors live on the floor with community participants. The Office of Multicultural Student Life partnered with University Housing staff to provide specialized training that specified the individual responsibilities of peer mentors-in-residence and the resident assistant. We also used this training as an opportunity to build community among the residence hall director, the resident assistant, and the four peer mentors-in-residence. Our emphasis on holistic community building even came into play as we planned our semester kick-off event. The event emphasized community expectations, relationship building, and social engagement among the 50 first-year participants, the four peer mentors-in-residence, and the resident assistant. Collaboration, cross-functionality, and responsiveness have been critical components of the coordination, operation, and implementation of this new initiative. The Multicultural Mentoring Program’s “Connect” Living and Learning Community has helped students connect with the larger campus community while also having a smaller community of peers to whom they can relate on various levels. Through integrative assessment practices, we will evaluate the impact of continued partnerships across student affairs and academic affairs units on this living and learning community—particularly in regard to student retention and graduation—for decades to come. To learn more about our mentoring program and the living and learning community, visit our departmental webpage at multicultural.utk.edu.
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College athletics provides a robust student experience with potential for teamwork, camaraderie, and leadership development. But Baird (2002) discusses the homo-negative and heterosexist climate that often exists among college athletic programs. Sports can lead to personal struggle, discrimination, and harassment (Griffin, 1998). In particular, bias and discrimination against gay and lesbian athletes have been found to occur through negative stereotypes, verbal comments, social isolation, homophobic harassment, discrimination in team selection, and negative media attention (Roper & Halloran, 2007). With the coming out of athletes Michael Sam, Robbie Rogers, Abby Wambach, Brittney Griner, and Jason Collins, LGBTQ student-athletes today enjoy climates that are more receptive than ever. Rankin and Merson (2012) stated that “LGBT students today are more out and vocal than ever before, and those who are also athletes deserve to know which schools and which athletics programs will respect them for who they are” (p. 1). But amid this positive national shift, many challenges still exist for LGBTQ student-athletes.
Climate
Rankin and Merson (2012) discussed the impact of university climate on LGBTQ student-athletes’ academic and athletic outcomes. A 2011 study by the Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network (GLSEN) found that more than 25% of LGBTQ student-athletes reported experiencing harassment or some form of assault due to sexual orientation while playing on a school sports team. Rankin and Merson (2012) further explained that:

LGBTQ student-athletes generally experience a more negative climate than their heterosexual peers and although sexual identity is not a direct predictor of the outcomes, the way LGBTQ student-athletes experience the climate indirectly affects their academic success as well as their athletic identity. (p. 6)

To respond to these concerns, campus studies to assess the impact of climate on LGBTQ athletes—followed by strategic measures to mitigate factors that negatively impact academic outcomes or connectedness—would be helpful to students.

Inclusive Language
The use of inclusive language is important for the growth and well-being of all student-athletes, staff, and coaches. In the NCAA Champions of Respect resource guide, Griffin and Taylor (2013) noted that:

We must address LGBTQ issues in sports because some traditions long accepted in athletics do not promote or reflect a culture of inclusion, diversity, or respect. Practices such as LGBTQ or sexist name-calling as a way to taunt opponents or shame poorly performing team members, team hazing rituals . . . or older athletes bullying young team members all encourage student-athletes to view actions that promote humiliation and disrespect as part of the game rather than the divisive and destructive distractions that they are. (p. 4)

We should avoid using terminology that is degrading or has negative connotations, because that contributes to student-athletes withholding public disclosure of their sexual orientation. We should value the individualism of everyone within our campus communities and use language that demonstrates respect for myriad backgrounds.

Viable Development of Allies
Student Affairs Leadership
Roper (2005) noted that it is essential that all senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) demonstrate “that LGBT students, faculty, and staff are valued colleagues and community members” (p. 85). By supporting and attending Safe Zone or Ally Trainings, SSAOs move campus discussions about supporting LGBTQ students from simple tolerance to actioned approaches that embrace differences, uplift uniqueness, and demonstrate inclusivity.

Greek-letter Organizations
Meriwether and Hart (in press) encouraged the development and implementation of campus-wide ally trainings for fraternities and sororities that capture the climate and nuances of the individual campus. Within the context of this type of training, Worthen (2014) expounded on the value of utilizing trainings for fraternities to discuss issues of bias and stereotyping. Leveraging the influential nature of fraternities and sororities on the student experience is a viable area of ally development.

Student-athlete Allies
Worthen (2014) discussed opportunities for ally training among athletes. Elfman (2013) noted that male allies are less likely to face questions about their sexual orientation, while female allies often face accusations of being a lesbian, which creates barriers to partnerships and advocacy for female athletes. It is important for campus leadership to set a clear path for student-athlete allies to actively engage their peers by offering trainings that combat stereotypes and other negative themes.

Intentional Messaging
Indiana University Southeast, the University of Vermont, and the University of California, Los Angeles, among numerous other colleges and universities, have joined the You Can Play Project (youcanplayproject.org) and sent a deliberate message of support for LGBTQ student-athletes. These videos capture messages from athletes, athletic administrators, faculty, and other members of campus leadership to express a welcoming environment for LGBTQ student-athletes. Meriwether and Hart (in press) discuss the impact of messaging that shapes an environment for LGBTQ student-athletes to thrive when trying to mitigate the challenge of balancing academic demands and identity development.

Conclusion
Student-athletes who are questioning their sexual orientation or gender identity need a supportive environment where they can come to a healthy and comfortable identity for themselves without fear or external pressures. As noted by Rankin and Merson (2012), we must address the experiences of LGBTQ student-athletes by examining the impact of harassment and discrimination on their academic and athletic success. Coaches, teammates, and university administrators must develop an understanding of LGBTQ identity and how it is affected by athletic culture for the benefit of openly gay athletes and for those who have not yet publicly shared their sexual orientation. Supporting LGBTQ student-athletes can lead to increased success on their respective playing fields and throughout other campus communities. The role of allies in shifting climate and culture toward being safe, inclusive, and embracing of LGBTQ athletes is significant and should be encouraged on all campuses.
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One of the benefits of a career in student affairs is the opportunity to work directly with college students. The adviser role is a prime example of direct interaction with students. In this article, I will explore the work of professional advising that takes place in departments, clubs, organizations, and activities. Advising is the “intervention process in a group to affect behavior of individuals in the group and/or the group itself” (Dunkel & Schuh, 1998, p. 20). The Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [ACPA & NASPA], 2010) highlights the skills and aptitudes needed within the profession—the first topic within this publication being Advising and Helping. The nuances of advising are described within the list of basic skills in the competencies; establishing rapport, listening, reflecting, communicating (verbal and nonverbal), strategizing, and managing crises are some pertinent examples (ACPA & NASPA, 2010).

**Advisers Make a Difference**

In a recent project, Whitney, Vandermoon, and Mynaugh (2013) discussed the work of programming with the campus student activities board at DePaul University. The researchers thought the information was going to center on the process of creating and implementing events and activities programs. Surprisingly, the student programming leaders mentioned advising first. They noted that their learning process had to be guided by their advisers. The conversation among the group of students centered on several themes. They mentioned that advisers “keep [them] on track” because they “know the policies of the university” and work at a “higher level” on campus. They said that the adviser serves as “more of an educator.” Probably the most beautiful statement was that advisers “challenge [them] and support [them]” through the process and that advisers are like “teachers without the title.” Their comments were fresh and unsolicited, but it was as if they had read books on experiential pedagogy (Fried, 2012). The advising intervention process facilitates student involvement, which encourages learning and engagement (Astin, 1999; Dunkel & Schuh, 1998).

The students in this focus group presented Sanford’s theory of challenge and support (1969) with such profound innocence and impact. Student affairs educators have a tendency to use a challenge and support approach, sometimes forgetting the complexity of our work. Sanford (1969) explained two additional components of readiness and rates of development. The concept of readiness reminds us that we cannot have an impact on a student without his or her permission; he or she has to be ready and open to the information, examples, and teaching-points. Additionally, rates of development are scaled on the individuality of students, their personal history, and culture.

Although Sanford (1969) does not mention waiting, it is the key to advisement. The learning process requires the resolution of conflicting information as we create an expanded sense of knowledge or a new paradigm (Kolb, 1984). The same is true for new information students gain through the advising process. In addition, leadership is an experiential activity moving between the concrete and the abstract through reflection to deepen previous leadership understanding. This allows the learner to implement a new action as a result of the newfound knowledge. Learning takes time and depends on the student’s skills and experience—meaning, we have to wait to see the change in students. It could happen quickly or it could take some time or repeated conversations. Unfortunately, we do not always have the privilege of seeing the change in students.
The leadership of advising is an important responsibility; it is about the role modeling of actions, behaviors, and attitudes (Cuyjet, 1996; Dunkel & Schuh, 1998). Advisers can view themselves from the transformational leadership theory, which transforms followers’ self-concepts to help link the followers to the collective organizational identity (Burns, 1978, 2003). Within this approach, both the leaders (i.e., advisers) and the followers (i.e., students) are validated for having an expertise and unique strengths. The constant movement of foreground/background rotates among all leaders/followers in the group; all are seen as leaders (Wheatley, 1996). As one of the leaders in the group is tapped to share his or her strength, he or she moves into the foreground while the others move to the background. This works for the adviser leader when dealing with committee colleagues and/or the members of a student group. Burns (1978) uses the term transforming leader, which connects to the mutual benefits and the active relationship between leader and followers. Transforming might also address the inner work and personal change the leader undergoes through connecting with followers. The adviser leader has the responsibility for creating opportunities for, and seeking contributions from, the students. This action creates learning opportunities and a collaborative space, models inclusivity, and breeds respect for differences and individuality.

Leadership development is a process (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). Our job as leadership educators is layered with opportunity to work with students and to create a learning space through challenge and support. We have to honor our own processes and pause at times to create a learning space through challenge and support. We have to honor our own processes and pause at times to create a learning space through challenge and support. Research shows that understanding how we are developing our leadership acumen is layered with opportunity to work with students and to create a learning space through challenge and support. Both functions are vital to our work for students directly and for students through the modality of advising other students.

The Leadership of Advising
The leadership of advising is an important responsibility; it is about the role modeling of actions, behaviors, and attitudes (Cuyjet, 1996; Dunkel & Schuh, 1998). Advisers can view themselves from the transformational leadership theory, which transforms followers’ self-concepts to help link the followers to the collective organizational identity (Burns, 1978, 2003). Within this approach, both the leaders (i.e., advisers) and the followers (i.e., students) are validated for having an expertise and unique strengths. The constant movement of foreground/background rotates among all leaders/followers in the group; all are seen as leaders (Wheatley, 1996). As one of the leaders in the group is tapped to share his or her strength, he or she moves into the foreground while the others move to the background. This works for the adviser leader when dealing with committee colleagues and/or the members of a student group. Burns (1978) uses the term transforming leader, which connects to the mutual benefits and the active relationship between leader and followers. Transforming might also address the inner work and personal change the leader undergoes through connecting with followers. The adviser leader has the responsibility for creating opportunities for, and seeking contributions from, the students. This action creates learning opportunities and a collaborative space, models inclusivity, and breeds respect for differences and individuality.

Leadership development is a process (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). Our job as leadership educators is layered with opportunity to work with students and to create a learning space through challenge and support. We have to honor our own processes and pause at times to understand how we are developing our leadership acumen through experience and reflection. Research shows that how we teach reflects how we learn and take in information (Riding, 2002). Advising and mentoring are functions of role modeling and working with students. Mahatma Gandhi said, “Your beliefs become your thoughts, your thoughts become your words, your words become your actions, your actions become your habits, your habits become your values, your values become your destiny.” Do not forget to examine your own leadership process and reflect on lessons learned. This is healthy for us, as well as another form of modeling for our students.
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The authors of this article conducted a review of the International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education (2009–2014) to search for ways student affairs professionals could impact global sustainability efforts in higher education. Four topics dominated the literature: research, resources, leadership, and curriculum. Because elements of each topic fell outside the normal purview of student affairs, we broadened the scope of our synthesis; however, practical applications of the knowledge remained our focus.

Research was the most common topic in the literature. There were almost universal calls for increasing funding, shifting funding priorities, and fostering interdisciplinary investigations of sustainability as well as wide recognition that findings needed to be communicated to more people and in more accessible ways. Some researchers noted that local implementation of their findings led to increased support for broader sustainability efforts and that involving campus partners yielded a much more sustained educational result (Bilodeau, Podger, & Abd-El-Aziz, 2014).
Student affairs professionals can put this information into practice by learning about sustainability experts on their campuses or in their communities, and then incorporating those resources into everyday conversations and events. Further, simply offering students encouragement may lead them to apply for research positions, create organizations, campaign for policy changes, or consider graduate education in the field of sustainability. Finally, designing events that bring together the local and campus communities can lead to meaningful information exchange among diverse participants and can spur innovation.

Resources were the second most discussed topic in the literature. This broad category included time, land, capital, and labor, but the production and use of energy dwarfed all other areas within this category. The literature lent unambiguous support to a 2013 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that unequivocally attributes global climate change to anthropogenic (i.e., human-caused) sources of energy production (IPCC, 2013). Further, because of the dramatic forms these changes are predicted to take (e.g., crop failures, species extinctions), the literature asserts that all of humanity will face the results of their consumption processes regardless of their belief in or understanding of climate change. We believe that student affairs professionals must educate themselves about this unfolding catastrophe, must aid in the process of educating others about it, and must encourage the higher education community at large to become a more resource-minded body. Such actions can take many forms, but a few examples might include: advocating for divestment in fossil fuels and investment in green technology, challenging leadership to assess and increase energy efficiency across all systems, spurring students to become involved in clean energy research, and spreading awareness of climate change and the implications it has on the human species.

Leadership was the third most common topic in the literature. The development or adoption of an assessment tool that can provide reliable and easily compared financial, social, and environmental performance measures of sustainability was a common need. Extant examples have been critiqued as too narrow, too broad, or as minimal standards that breed a culture of compliance and preclude innovation (James & Card, 2012; Waheed, Khan, & Veitch, 2011). Although much of the information addressed the qualities and skills needed in sustainability-minded senior administration, a significant portion was also dedicated to the effectiveness of distributed leadership (Davison et al., 2013). In part, this is a product of a knowledge-value-action gap (Chaplin & Wyton, 2014; Wright, 2010), where no one person or small number of people in a system possesses the knowledge, influence, or resources to tackle enormously complex issues like sustainability (Brinkhurst, Rose, Maurice, & Ackerman, 2011). The literature suggests that scientific literacy—a basic understanding of the scientific method and its products—is a formidable cognitive framework to help leaders at all levels make sustainability-related decisions responsibly (Bacon et al., 2011). Given all of the above, student affairs professionals already have a powerful set of tools to engage sustainability: the values that encourage lifelong learning as well as the ability to inspire students and colleagues through conversation, to teach reflective thinking, to connect people with resources that feed their intellectual curiosities, and to mobilize a strong culture of assessment in order to measure the effects of programs and services.

Curriculum was the fourth most common topic in the literature. A 2010 Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) report was cited often and presents a compelling synthesis of four significant curricular challenges. First, curriculum cannot be prescribed and relies on the expertise of faculty to develop and teach it. Second, sustainability is an enormous topic that can be covered by multiple departments within one institution. Third, our higher education system often silos disciplines into departments and does not always support the cooperation that sustainability necessitates. Lastly, the sheer number and diversity in types of higher education institutions forms a uniquely challenging environment in which to develop a coherent sustainability curriculum (AASHE, 2010). Although curriculum design is not often the realm of student affairs professionals, there is an unprecedented opportunity to augment classroom learning and engage all members of our educational community in cooperatively designed extracurricular experiences. Such activities as service-learning, town hall discussions, conversations with advisors, alumni meet-and-greets, career center fairs, student leadership workshops, and student employee training are all examples of fora where student affairs professionals can partner with sustainability experts to inject information that will enhance the curriculum. Such offerings provide additional educational bandwidth for institutions as they prepare their students for a sustainability economy driven by the intersectionality of scientific, technical, and socioeconomic disciplines (Bootsma & Vermeulen, 2011).

A common conclusion also tied all of these topics together: If higher education institutions are to prosper in the future, they must do a better job of defining and understanding “sustainability,” communicate that information more effectively to stakeholders, and include a wider variety of voices in decision making. Navigating this challenge courageously will require a great deal of effort, but student affairs professionals are uniquely positioned to have a lasting, positive impact.
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In the field of student affairs, blogging—as a medium for professional development, community building, and connections—has gained momentum. Student affairs educators who embrace and implement social media tools are setting a new bar for higher education collaboration, communication, and knowledge sharing. Blogging is one of the many resources available in exploring online and mobile platforms. Through social media, education leaders can “engage in the creation and development of content and gather online to share knowledge, information, and opinions using web-based applications and tools” (Grover & Stewart, 2010, p. 9). Blogging about your profession takes bravery, but it is worth it: It lets us tell our stories.
Social Media Use in Higher Education
Looking at faculty and administrators’ use of social media, the fastest-growing social media demographic is 35 and older (Malesk & Peters, 2012). Between 2009 and 2011, the gap between younger and older adults using social media decreased, with 25% of adults on social media in 2009 increasing to 51% in 2011 (Tess, 2013). Faculty and scholars have also been studied, noting the blurred lines of professional and personal content online (Veletsianos, 2011). The types of usage most commonly seen in the classroom are blogs and wikis (Tinti-Kane, 2013).

Twitter is another social media platform that has proven effective with faculty use in the classroom. It has yielded many positive results, such as higher student GPAs, creation of study groups, increased faculty and student interaction, and students feeling more equipped for the future (Junco, Heiberger, & Loken, 2011). However, social media usage comes with tensions in academia, as faculty attempt to maintain professional and personal relationships and connections through social media (Veletsianos, 2013). No studies have been published that explore student affairs administrators’ use of blogging.

Blogging in Higher Education
A blog is a website that is managed by an individual, group, or organization. Its posts include such options as text, pictures, videos, comments, and more. Blogs are very interactive. For example, after a post is published, readers and authors can comment, share, and update the post with more content. Examples of blogging platforms include Blogger, Medium, and WordPress.

Blogging challenges leaders to be innovative as they establish a presence and identity online. Studying the psychology of blogging, Gurak and Antonijevic (2008) found that this digital activity produces twofold communication. First, bloggers establish their own voice and expression. Second, they are transformed by audience interactions, which the authors call “rewriting oneself.” This transformation makes blogging a process of linking two or more individuals not known before (Gurak and Antonijevic, 2008). Blogging in the field of student affairs has significant potential, as it can construct global links for sharing knowledge, networking with others, and advancing careers.

Veletsianos (2013) asked what activities and practices arise when researchers and educators use social media, finding that usage includes both in-class and non-class use. The study found that even personal sharing was valuable in the academic community. This was observed of Twitter, with Veletsianos claiming that “it appears that engagement with and sharing about issues unrelated to the profession is a value that is celebrated by this community” (2013, p. 646). This study is pivotal in the argument to blog about your profession in education.

The results highlighted that faculty were celebrated for their content contributions online—professionally and personally—despite possible challenges. Educators must weigh the pros and cons of creating a blog. Many authors believe that the positives outweigh the risks: “Blogging allows you to speak out authentically on your own behalf, and in the long run people will recognize that. Do it consistently, and they trust you” (Nackerud & Scaletta, 2008). Building trust online is a pivotal part of being a blogger, especially as a student affairs professional, and in establishing credibility.

Becoming a Blogger
Do you have the courage to be a student affairs leader beyond your campus? Blogging can extend your reach as an innovative and transformational leader in the field. With one tweet using the hashtag #SAChat, your blog has the potential to be read and shared, as well as criticized. This type of leadership presence online takes courage. Blogging challenges student affairs leaders to define purpose, voice, and niche in order to transform higher education. But that is only the beginning.

The following 10 questions are designed to guide you through creating a blog. Use them as a baseline as you build or reimagine your professional blog. As you consider the answers to these questions, keep in mind your personal/professional boundaries and a possible code of ethics for how you will approach your work online.

1. What is your niche?
2. What is your brand?
3. What platform and technological tools should you use?
4. What is your blog design, and what does it convey?
5. How can you be authentic in the way you represent yourself?
6. How will you promote your blog?
7. How can you unify all of your digital presences (or not at all)?
8. How can you interpret your traffic data and analytics?
9. How can you responsibly write, cite, and give credit?
10. How can you engage the student affairs community, including positive and negative interactions?

A blog is not created overnight. Your blog, expertise, and experience will evolve. Revisit these guiding questions as you grow as a student affairs blogger. Also, make sure to reach out to other bloggers to get feedback and support. Join the Student Affairs Blogger Community: #SAwrites Whether or not you blog, we should support each other as colleagues. Get to know bloggers in the student affairs community.
community who write about topics of interest. I encourage readers to join the discourse by commenting, sharing, and building the momentum of student affairs writers, researchers, and thought leaders in higher education. Use the hashtag #SAwrites to connect with other bloggers in our industry on Twitter and share your expertise to better our profession.
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Each year, several publications release lists of colleges and universities judged by them to be “veteran-friendly.” These publications range from popular media, such as U.S. News & World Report, to business journals, like Forbes, to military-oriented, including GI Jobs and Military.com. Criteria used to rate and rank the schools range from minimal—such as Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOCs) membership along with acceptance of the Concurrent Application—to more in-depth examinations of the number and kinds of services offered. Some lists provide a broad cross-section of schools, while others focus on a select group, such as online programs, to rank. What is important to remember is that the criteria, selection methods, and rankings have very little to do with the things veterans in higher education need to help them be most academically and socially successful.
Those who work with military and veteran programs in higher education know that being veteran-friendly entails more than maintaining SOC membership or offering the Yellow Ribbon Program with the Post 9/11 G.I. Bill. It does not necessarily mean that a college must have a one-stop-shop veterans’ center to attend to all veteran-related matters. Agreeing to review military transcripts for applicable academic credit and having a veterans’ club also do not automatically put a school in the veteran-friendly category. Although such offerings and other functional resources do serve to better support veterans in higher education, it does a disservice to veterans to use these services as the bar-setting criteria for veteran-friendly institutions.

Some veterans use these lists to make serious decisions about where to use their hard-earned education benefits. Veterans rely on the information to help them determine where to attend, what support services will be offered, and how long it takes to complete a program of study. Of concern, however, is that veterans themselves do not know what it means for schools to be veteran-friendly and are, therefore, subject to making ineffective decisions based on false or misleading information. Without a clear picture of what veteran-friendly truly means, veterans can be drawn to educational environments that do not support their retention, leading them to spend valuable benefits on courses of study that do not end in viable careers. This has been the case at many institutions that were credited as veteran-friendly by media-based lists.

The unfortunate reality is that these online and media-based military and veteran rankings are neither empirically grounded nor unbiased; most veterans and veteran services offices wholly disregard these lists as self-serving and useless. One of these companies, Victory Media, even undertook an initiative to copyright the term “military-friendly” so as to further capitalize on the surge of veterans on our campuses (Vacchi & Perry, 2014). The problem with these rankings is that they are based on self-report surveys and do not include the perceptions of students themselves, making them biased at best and entirely misleading at worst. It is the position of the NASPA Veterans Knowledge Community (VKC) to disregard these ranking systems and seek the more-informed perspective of current student veterans regarding a particular campus’s climate.

Being a “veteran-friendly” school means going beyond the “friendly” label and fostering an institutional culture that is supportive, respectful, and inclusive of the veterans it educates. Being “veteran-friendly” means providing all of the basic supportive services previously discussed, in addition to many more programmatic components to build a campus climate geared toward supporting veterans’ holistic success in higher education and engaging veterans in their education and growth toward a new career in civilian life. The following table (Minnis, 2014a; Minnis 2014b) lists some of these important components that institutions can implement to build a “veteran-friendly” campus climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Cultural Competency Training</th>
<th>Implement military cultural competency training campus-wide, particularly for those responsible for teaching and advising activities, to learn how to effectively educate veterans and make thoughtful referrals to supportive resources without stigmatizing this unique student population.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>Veterans pursue higher education to equip themselves with knowledge and skills to pursue new careers and want to know how their military education will be credited and what their programs’ graduation requirements are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services Outreach &amp; Staff Training</td>
<td>Because veterans may not know about or seek career service assistance, informed career service representatives should initiate contact with veterans so that they are aware of available resources and how to access them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Counseling, Disability Services, and Student Health</td>
<td>Veterans in higher education need information about resources to address mental health, disability, and other challenges unique to their experience in the military; therefore, campus resources must work collaboratively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid and Business Services</td>
<td>Financial Aid representatives should be prepared, in line with the President’s 2012 Executive Order on Principles of Excellence for Military Tuition Assistance and Veterans Education Benefits Programs (Minnis, 2014b), to fully explain the financial aid options available and true cost of education in addition to helping veterans understand their education benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Until a more robust body of research can demonstrate causality between various services or programs and student veteran success, the best recommendation the VKC can offer is to study the effects of various programs and services at the local level. While there is some empirical evidence that focuses on the academic interactions between veterans and their faculty and peer students (Vacchi, 2013), this study has not been replicated. Further, the most consistent theme among all research to date appears to be that timely and accurate processing of education benefits affects veterans’ perceptions of satisfaction with their college or university—that is, “veteran-friendliness”—the most (Vacchi and Berger, 2014). Veterans need support services that address the unique needs they bring to campus. Rather than resting on the label of “veteran-friendly” from media outlets, which
create rankings from only the most basic criteria, colleges and universities should seek to meet a higher standard of veteran-friendly by being helpful, supportive, and inclusive. As we seek to ensure acceptable veteran graduation rates, it is incumbent on higher education to provide the resources that will give veterans the best possible chance to succeed academically and socially.
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One cannot read a journal of higher education without seeing some reference highlighting such wellness issues as sexual violence, stress, mental health, alcohol abuse, or loan debt. College students are not sleeping enough, are increasingly misusing prescription drugs, continue to engage in high-risk drinking, and take out higher amounts of student loans. Colleges and universities have a responsibility to teach their students how to become healthy, productive adults, not just how to earn a living; they want their graduates to become globally competent citizens and healthy leaders.

Institutions today are faced with a number of health- and wellness-related issues. Results from the National College Health Assessment indicate students report that sleep disorders and stress impact their academic performance (American College Health Association, 2013, p. 5). Many studies indicate strong correlations between health and academic performance, student retention, and satisfaction levels (Felsten & Wilcox, 1992; Pritchard & Wilson, 2003, p. 24). Research specifically indicates that social adaptation, physical fitness, and emotional stability can affect retention (Astin, 1999).
Several years ago, Paula Swinford, a prominent leader in the health and wellness field, had the foresight to refocus discussions and the foundations of health and wellness work. In the 2012 NASPA Knowledge Community (KC) Publication, Swinford and Chan (2012) contributed an article on behalf of the Wellness and Health Promotion KC (formerly the Health and Higher Education KC) that is an essential read for anyone invested in the health of our campus communities. This seminal article includes a reading list for all professionals working in student development and serves as a primer for the application of solid public health theory and practice to campus communities.

There is a renewed opportunity to engage other campus constituents in the conversation and broaden the reach of health promotion and wellness. It is important to be cognizant of the unique needs of each campus, its desired goals, and the best means to achieve them. To best serve students, staff must consider new technologies, new ways to expand services, and new methods to gain support across campus. Given the myriad options, opportunities, and partnerships available, it is imperative to think more critically about the research backing wellness-area expansions. For example, with the increased emphasis on sexual violence education for all students, administrators may respond quickly to meet the Title IX expectations. This is a crucial time for professionals to consult with one another and to share knowledge and best practices. Many institutions have expanded their services to enhance the wellness of students; several of these institutions are highlighted below.

Javaune Adams-Gaston (2014), vice president for student life at The Ohio State University, has stated that almost everything we do in student life can be tied directly or indirectly to wellness. Some aspects are obvious, such as health services, wellness centers, and counseling and consultation services. Other connections are more subtle, such as promoting exercise and social interaction through recreational sports, offering a wide variety of foods (and making nutritional data easily accessible) in dining operations, and facilitating intercultural competency through multicultural centers.

Health and wellness areas on college campuses have repositioned themselves as keys to student success. Models of wellness have expanded from simply emotional and physical dimensions to include financial, diversity, environmental, spiritual, and other forms of wellness. The Ohio State University’s wellness philosophy incorporates multiple dimensions of wellness holistically, focusing on social, physical, intellectual, career, emotional, spiritual, environmental, creative, and financial wellness. This nine-pillar model addresses such behaviors as interpersonal violence, high-risk alcohol use, risky sex, inner strength, and even littering.

At the University of South Carolina, a campuswide wellness initiative provides such resources as fitness buddies; an interactive, seven-dimension wellness wheel; and healthy-choice icons on dining options. The University of Alabama engages faculty along with student affairs professionals in addressing wellness issues through its Strategic Health Teams Initiative. These seven teams cover the areas of alcohol and other drugs, eating disorders, mental health, sexual health, nutrition, tobacco, and financial health. The leadership structure of each team includes a faculty co-chair, student affairs co-chair, and a representative from Health Promotion and Wellness. The Strategic Health Teams provide recommendations on key health issues directly to the provost and the vice president of student affairs.

A big part of the commitment to wellness is helping students learn how to manage and define their own wellness. This may involve learning how to manage a budget, get out of or avoid an abusive relationship, or cope with a chronic illness. Wellness is a continual, lifelong process; student affairs staff seek to facilitate student wellness and provide students with tools they can use throughout their lives. West Virginia University offers wellness coaching; the University of Chicago helps students set goals and stay positive with The Resiliency Project; and many institutions base their coaching efforts with students on brief motivational interviewing.

Many institutions have turned to trained student volunteers to expand their services. These students receive academic credit and focus on leadership techniques, holistic wellness promotion, peer education, and personal development—all aimed to develop new wellness peer leaders and extend the reach of wellness programming. For example, The Ohio State University’s 50 financial peer coaches provide one-on-one financial coaching to more than 1,500 students annually; the University of Alabama’s Project Health peer educators reach 2,000 students weekly through the outreach efforts of the Health Hut, Health Ambassadors, and Health Advocates; and the University of Minnesota’s 90 peer educators run the sexual violence hotline.

Some institutions have combined their faculty and staff wellness efforts with their student wellness efforts to be better stewards of resources and to convey a centralized, comprehensive wellness focus on campus. Student life leaders must carefully consider this approach, as the efforts within student wellness units are to address every facet of a student’s life, while the wellness efforts for faculty and staff focus only on workplace wellness. The student wellness efforts are central to student learning, offering comprehensive, cocurricular programs and services to support students as they transition into and through the university, prepare for their chosen professions, and live in a global society.
The work of creating healthy communities is multifaceted and complex; however, campuses have an opportunity to rise to the occasion, to become a model—for the country—of the benefits of investing in the health of the community. Now is the time to utilize varying sources and types of data to drive the conversations, collaborations, and priorities on campuses and to identify specific collaborations critical for broadening the responsibility for wellness initiatives. Professionals can learn from others’ best practices, read peer-reviewed literature, and develop strategic plans with clear metrics. They can engage faculty to support research efforts. Collectively, we can move the field forward by putting the research into practice.
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Rath and Harter’s (2010) book, Wellbeing: The Five Essential Elements, is frequently used to advance conversations around well-being, human needs, and life satisfaction for student affairs professionals. As one of the most comprehensive global studies on well-being to date, representing 98% of the world’s population (Rath & Harter, 2010), the findings in this Gallup publication are worth noting for even the most skeptical individual, especially when coupled with research on employee satisfaction, turnover, and physical health (Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, & Morrell, 2000). Results are of particular interest for women in student affairs, a group historically less likely to exhibit high levels of career satisfaction and attend to personal renewal (Anderson et al., 2000; Trepka, 2006).

Women in Student Affairs
Research indicates female administrators may be significantly less satisfied overall with their jobs (Zurfluh & Reisser, 1990) and finds women without terminal degrees to be among the least satisfied when compared with male counterparts and female colleagues holding advanced degrees (Anderson et al., 2000). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) women, in particular, also exhibit lower responses when reporting a strong sense of purpose and physical well-being (Gates, 2014), demonstrating the need for an inclusive dialogue about well-being across subsectors of women.
Measuring Well-being

Given that student affairs professionals are called to advance wellness for our students and ourselves (American College Personnel Association, & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2010), women in student affairs are well served by quantifying, analyzing, and making meaning of their current well-being across a variety of elements.

Tools such as the Wellbeing Finder provided by Rath and Harter (2010) are of particular use and allow participants to measure well-being on a scale ranging from 0 to 10 across elements relating to career, social, financial, physical, and community well-being; areas Gallup claims differentiate a thriving life from one spent suffering. Those scoring between 7 and 10 in an element are said to be thriving and are described as “strong, consistent, and progressing” (Rath & Harter, 2010, p. 118). Those scoring below 4 are categorized as high risk and suffering, indicating a more immediate need for change (Rath & Harter, 2010). Individuals thriving in all five elements comprise only 7% of global respondents (Rath & Harter, 2010), which suggests that most individuals need to take action relating to their well-being.

Taking action to improve career well-being can be especially impactful for women. Deemed as the most essential of the five elements, research finds that “people with high career well-being are more than twice as likely to be thriving in their lives overall” (Rath & Harter, 2010, p. 16). By investing in career well-being, women, by default, invest in all areas of their well-being.

While some factors affecting women’s well-being can be categorized as systemic and oppressive, thereby demanding social action and large-scale change, women can take initial steps toward improving their individual well-being by gaining insight into their own capacity for resiliency-building behaviors and holistic self-care. The Well-being Finder, based on “measures within your control” (Rath & Harter, 2010, p. 119) allows women to create a plan for change rather than remain complacent. By doing so, it can assist many women in student affairs to frame times of transition, advancement, and everyday development in proactive ways.

Toward Thriving

Women crafting a plan for increased well-being can utilize knowledge about Rath and Harter’s (2010) five essential elements to narrow and direct their efforts. By doing so, women can address key areas of concern, such as career dissatisfaction, personal renewal, and physical well-being. The following are some suggested strategies for advancing career and physical well-being; two significant elements for women in student affairs.

Career Well-being:

- Utilize your strengths within the workplace. Research shows those utilizing their strengths enjoy higher levels of career satisfaction and more successfully avoid burnout (Rath & Harter, 2010).
- Find a “best friend” at work. Those with a close colleague in the workplace experience higher engagement levels, which also results in higher physical well-being (Harter, Schmidt, Agrawal, & Plowman, 2013).
- Seek to decrease ambiguity related to annual performance appraisals by developing written criteria, examining timelines, and integrating training for reviewers (Power, 2014).

Physical Well-being:

- Look for “opt-in” opportunities (Rath & Harter, 2010) for development, such as departmental fitness groups, insurance reduction plans, and auto-schedule options for annual appointments.
- Integrate physical well-being into your everyday routine through walking meetings, alternative office setups, and catering orders that reflect healthy eating options.
- Identify a social group to exercise with to increase accountability. Schedule plans directly after work to decrease long hours, or in the morning to boost your mood throughout the day (Rath & Harter, 2010).

A Place to Start

The above suggestions serve as a starting place for women as they begin to assess and consider well-being. Steps to improve personal well-being and the overall well-being of women in student affairs can start with small individual changes, but should always include efforts beyond the individual as well. Departments, managers, and professional associations play a strong role in advancing women’s well-being and should act in partnership to push forward individual efforts. Such efforts can start on day one, during hiring processes, on-boarding, and staff orientation. Emphasizing and creating a culture of well-being within your institution can be an invaluable retention strategy to keep key employees and establish early partnerships. Through dedicated planning, assessment, and partnership, well-being becomes a priority among professionals, and women in student affairs can move from surviving to thriving in the workplace.
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Do parent and family members call your office asking similar questions time and time again?

We can help!

Click here to sign up for our email newsletter to get helpful information that you can share with your families.
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